DOCTORAL THESIS

Para-philias transgressive sex in Ancient Greece

Malheiro Magalhães, José

Award date:
2020

Awarding institution:
University of Roehampton

Para-philias
Transgressive sex in Ancient Greece

by

José Malheiro Magalhães BA, MA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of PhD

Department of Humanities

University of Roehampton

2019

Abstract

The thesis explores sexual behaviour that the Greeks considered to transgress natural, social, legal and religious boundaries. The title, 'para-philias' - *para* (beside) + *philia* (love) - is a play on the modern psychological term 'paraphilias' used to categorize sexual activities deemed as mental disorders. I address four different examples of sexual behaviour that were considered transgressive, the act of looking at someone in a sexual, private situation, without being entitled to do so, 'Sexual visual transgression' (chapter 1); sexual contact between adults and prepubescent children, 'Child sexual abuse' (chapter 2); sexual intercourse between humans and animals, 'Human-animal sex' (chapter 3); and sexual intercourse between living humans and corpses, 'Sex with corpses' (chapter 4). I explore the above-mentioned activities and the transgressive aspects they share and provide an explanation for why the ancient Greeks considered these sexual activities to be beyond the scope of correct sexual behaviour. I analyse the sources that provide information on these practices, as well as the social context in which they were practised, exploring how these transgressions would have been perceived by people of different socio-economic backgrounds. By providing the points of view of citizens and non-citizens, rich and poor, men and women, free and slave, I show how the conception of normal and abnormal sexual practices was extremely flexible, changing according to the individual status of the intervenients and consequently provide a more accurate scope on sexual transgressions in ancient Greece.

By shedding light on the sexual behaviours that the ancient Greeks deemed transgressive, a topic that has never been explored in detail before in classical scholarship, this thesis provides a new insight into the dynamics of the sexual life of the ancient Greeks, exploring the concept of 'normal' and 'abnormal' sex while framing these two concepts within the particular social contexts of ancient Greece.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

From all the words that almost one decade of Higher Education led me to write, none gave me more satisfaction than these, my final contribution to this thesis. It has been a long, arduous learning process, and today I understand the numerous tales I was told by people that underwent the same process, of how personally demanding, exhausting but nevertheless intellectually rewarding writing a doctoral thesis is. Moreover, today I understand the sweet dichotomy of this entire process, being both a very lonely, self-involved endeavour and an achievement that benefits from the contribution of many, who I now have the opportunity to thank.

Not even in my wildest dreams had I imagined that one day I would go through the experience of studying in London, and especially in an institution like Roehampton. Therefore, first I want to express my gratitude to the University of Roehampton for making undreamt dreams come true. This entire adventure was only possible due to the Vice-Chancellor's scholarship that the University awarded me in 2015, when I was still in the process of writing my MA thesis. The past three years surpassed my greatest expectations and expanded my horizons to lengths never before imagined. I will always be grateful to Roehampton, which will always feel like home to me.

No words can express my gratitude to my phenomenal supervisory team, Prof. Susan Deacy, Prof. Fiona McHardy and Prof. Mike Edwards, without whom these words would most definitely never been written. I will never forget the support that they offered me, from the very first email exchanged, months before we ever got the chance to actually meet, to this exact moment. I will never forget the thousands of emails, numerous meetings, informal conversations and overall relentless support that they offered me through all these years. Whenever I think about the possibility of playing their role to a young student in the future, I can only hope that I will be able to fill their shoes and live

up to the example they set for me, and this is, I believe, the greatest expression of the influence that they had on my personal path that I can put into writing.

In the past three years I had the opportunity to be involved in a variety of activities in Roehampton that granted me a wider perception of the Higher Education world, of how a university works, providing me with an opportunity to benefit the most from my time as a doctoral student. I want to express my gratitude to the staff at the Graduate School and Humanities department of the University of Roehampton, for all the support and constant help in the past three years. From Prof. Ted Vallance, who was present in my PhD interview and has always been available to clarify all of my doubts concerning the doctoral process at Roehampton, to all of the classical civilization lecturers and Humanities departmental staff, a big thank you.

Many thanks to Prof. Nuno Simões Rodrigues and Prof. Rodrigo Furtado, who have supported this doctoral project since the start, indeed being the writers of the original recommendation letters that were attached to my scholarship application. Their guidance and support ever since I started my academic journey, almost a decade ago, is invaluable and I can only hope to continue having it for years to come.

Still today I cannot believe the luck that I had with my flatmates at Roehampton. Leaving your home and your loved ones and moving into a new country for the first time will always be a scary, challenging thing to do. Sharing a home with such outstanding people that became family from the first day I set foot in London was important beyond words. To Margaux, Soo, Mary, Mariel, Lloyd, Meret and Louisa thank you for all the fantastic times and treasured memories.

An especial thank you also to my fellow PhD students at Roehampton. It has been an enormous pleasure to share this journey with you, and good luck on the path ahead of you. I am rooting for you all.

There is no way of expressing my gratitude to my family. To Tia Fátima and Tio Berto, Bruno and Cátia, for making me feel that I will always be a part of their home. To

my sister, Carolina, for all the support and for starting every conversation in past few years with the question, “have you finished the thesis yet?” I am very glad to finally be able to say YES! And especially to Daniela, for the relentless, non-stop support, and for filling me with a sense of everlasting happiness, no matter what.

However, despite all this mountain-moving support, none of these words would have been written without my mother, Conceição, and father, Alberto. Their capacity and willingness to support me in any situation, anyway, anytime, independently of agreeing or in fact understanding what I do, never ceases to amaze me. For everything that you do for me every day, without ever asking for anything in return, this thesis is dedicated to you.

It was hard, but it was worth it!

Translations and Abbreviations

Authors and titles of ancient works are abbreviated according to the list of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (fourth edition).

INTRODUCTION

The sexual life of the ancient Greeks has been one of the hot topics in classical scholarship for the last forty years. From single volumes that provide a general perception of sex in ancient Greece,[1] to studies that focus on more specific objects of research such as the sexual life of women,[2] homoerotism,[3] pederasty[4] and sexual violence[5], among other specific subjects, there is today a vast scholarship on sexuality in ancient Greece. However, to date no full-length study exists that is focused on sexual activities that the ancient Greeks deemed as wrong, transgressive, against human nature and social norm. In 1932, Hans Licht (the pseudonym used by Professor Paul Brandt) published the English version of his work on sexuality, entitled *Sexual life in ancient Greece*. Although the book is not focused on transgressive sex, one of its sections was dedicated to 'Perversions of Greek Sexual life', where he explored nine different types of sexual behaviour that were considered perverted, at Licht's time.[6] The only other classical work dedicated to the study of abnormal sexual activities in ancient Greece was published almost eighty years after Licht's book. In a chapter entitled "Sexual variations: sexual peculiarities of the ancient Greeks and Romans", John Younger briefly discussed sexual activities that he describes as 'transgressions'.[7] Besides these two publications, the only modern work that aims to approach transgressive sex in an ancient culture is Aggrawal's article (2009) on references to paraphilias in the Bible. Despite the completely different disciplinary background of the authors (Aggrawal is a professor of forensic medicine,

[1] See Licht (1932), Foucault (1987), Skinner (2005), Johnson and Ryan (2005), Hubbard (2014), Masterson, Rabinowitz and Robson (2015).
[2] See Pomeroy (1975), Lefkowitz (1986), Sissa (1990), James (2012), Harris (2015), Glazebrook (2016)
[3] See Sergent (1986, 1986a), Dover (1989), Davidson (1997, 2001, 2007), Hubbard (1998, 2000), Rabinowitz and Auanger (2002), Cantarella (2002), Verstraete and Provencal (2005).
[4] See Shapiro (1981, 2000), Percy (1996), Dodd (2000), Hubbard (2000, 2005, 2006), Cartledge (2001), Konstan (2002), Scanlon (2005), Laes (2010) Lear (2011, 2014, 2015), Lear and Cantarella (2008), Shapiro (2015). I want to express my gratitude to Prof. Thomas Hubbard for granting me access to one of his articles.
[5] See Karakantza (2003), Deacy and Pierce (2002), Gaca (2012, 2014, 2015), Deacy and McHardy (2013), Deacy (2013, 2018).
[6] "Mixoscopy, Transvestitismus, Exhibitionism, Pygmalionism, Flagellation, Sadism, Masochism, Sodomy, Nekrophilia".
[7] "Transvestism, bestiality, necrophilia".

without formal training in classics), these publications share the same methodological approach. They look for ancient references to sexual activities that are considered transgressive, according to a modern concept of transgressive sexual behaviour, without exploring how they were perceived in the specific societies where they were practised.

To date, scholarship on sexuality in the ancient world has failed to address accurately the sexual activities that were deemed transgressive by the ancient Greeks. The studies already mentioned by Licht, Younger and Aggrawal approach ancient sexuality from a modern perspective, applying terminology and concepts that do not translate and adapt to ancient Greek and ancient Greek culture. There is a tendency in classical scholarship to mix – even if sometimes unintentionally, simply by using a modern term in the discussion of ancient sex - modern perspectives of sex with the perception that the ancient Greeks had of their own sexual behaviour. Until now, no methodology that enables an approach to sexual transgressions in a non-anachronistic way has been developed. Furthermore, since the studies that do try to explore 'abnormal' sex in ancient Greece are almost non-existent – and the ones that do exist, such as Licht and Younger's chapters, are short, limited studies - no scholarship to date has pointed out the similar traces and patterns that these sexual acts share, how the construction of a concept of transgressive sex was framed and how ancient Greek societies reacted when faced with occurrences of these sexual behaviours. Exploring the sexual acts that ancient Greeks deemed transgressive has not been a serious focus of classical scholarship to this point, consequently missing the existence of a concept of sexual transgressions. This thesis fills that gap by developing a methodology that enables a non-anachronistic approach to sexual transgressions in ancient Greece and providing evidence that supports the claim that the ancient Greeks had a conception of what I term para-philias, that is, of various transgressive sexual acts that shared a considerable number of similar traits.

In this thesis I explore some of the sexual activities that the Greeks considered to transgress natural, social and in some examples even legal and religious boundaries. I

explore four specific examples of transgressive sexual behaviour: the act of looking at someone in a sexual, private situation, without being entitled to do so, which I have named 'Sexual visual transgression'; sexual contact between adults and children that were considered too young to be sexually active, 'Child sexual abuse'; sexual intercourse between humans and animals, 'Human-animal sex'; and sexual intercourse between living humans and corpses, 'Sex with corpses'. Four examples of sexual behaviour that I chose to denominate as para-philias. By restricting this research to these four activities I am not implying that there are no other examples of sexual transgressions conveyed by the ancient sources. As I show in the following sections, besides these four sexual activities ancient authors also made references to other behaviours, including sex with a mother, sexual intercourse between individuals of the same biological sex and oral sex, among other examples. These sexual activities are considered transgressions by some ancient authors, like the four that I chose to explore in this thesis. The rationale behind this choice is partially of a practical nature. Considering the space limitations of one thesis, it would not be possible to cover every potential example of sexual transgression, therefore a choice had to be made. I chose to analyse four sexual activities that, until now, have been underexplored by classical scholarship. By this, I am not implying that other sexual behaviours considered transgressive do not need to be addressed. On the contrary, I believe that activities such as sex between direct family members – which today we would most likely refer to as incest – or sex between humans of the same biological sex deserve closer scholarly attention as potentially transgressive acts. This thesis provides a model for how a scholar (including my future self and others) might tackle these areas.

My aim here is to explore the above-mentioned activities and the transgressive aspects they share, and to analyse the sources that provide information on these practices, as well as of the social context in which they were practised and understand why the ancient Greeks considered these sexual activities to be beyond the scope of correct sexual behaviour.

The sexual activities that I explore in this thesis share common traits with sexual activities that we, today, refer to as paraphilias, sexual psychological disorders, specifically voyeurism, paedophilia, zoophilia and necrophilia. The *DSM-V*, the latest edition of the psychiatry manual of the American Psychiatric Association, defines paraphilia as "any intense and persistent sexual interest other than sexual interest in genital stimulation or preparatory fondling with phenotypically normal, physically mature, consenting human partners". This definition has suffered considerable modifications since the first edition of the manual, where sexual behaviours such as paedophilia were listed under "sexual deviation", instead of "paraphilias", which would only be used in the *DSM* from the third edition (1980) on. The fact that the sexual practices that I explore in this thesis share some traits with sexual practices that today's modern western societies recognize as transgressive, from both a psychiatric and a legal point of view, has influenced classical scholars to adopt terms such as voyeurism and zoophilia when addressing ancient Greek societies.[8] This is, in my view, not the most accurate approach. The sexual behaviours listed under paraphilias are a modern construction, broadly based in today's western sexual mores, and defined in opposition to the 21st century western social conception of normal sexual behaviour. The social context in which these behaviours are defined, today, is vastly different from the social context of ancient Greece. There are various parallels that can be established between ancient and modern behaviours; however, exploring an ancient culture through a modern lens without providing the necessary distance eventually leads to anachronistic conclusions. Therefore, I usually rely on modern scholarship on, for example, voyeurism and paedophilia, mainly to explain how the simple adaptation of the modern concept to the ancient sources is not a good solution. The title of this thesis, para-philias, is an obvious play on modern paraphilias; however by para-philias I mean exactly the original

[8] I explore the usage of these terms in classical scholarship in the introduction to each chapter.

significance of the Greek terms *para* (beside) + *philia* (love), specifically the sexual activities that are perceived as non-normal sex in ancient Greece, and not the application of the modern definition of paraphilias to the ancient world. In no way, when approaching modern psychiatric scholarship on the subject, do I intend to propose that the ancient Greeks considered the examples of transgressive sexual behaviour here explored as mental disorders. Except from one possible reference concerning the sexual abuse of children, there is no clear reference to the psychological spectrum of the transgressions explored in this thesis, in ancient sources.

0.1 Transgressive sexual behaviours

What is transgressive sex? What makes a sexual act transgressive? If we take the point of view of today's western world, we can argue that a transgressive sexual act is the one that negates one's right to consent as well as sexual activities where one of the partners does not have the capacity to consent. If we take UK law as an example, this becomes quite clear. The first three points of the 2003 *Sexual Offences Act* focus on rape, assault and causing sexual activity without consent. Most of the other points are related to the sexual abuse of children and of persons with a mental disorder that impedes choice. A stipulation of sexual transgression based on the capacity of consent is adequate to the social panorama of the 21st century western world, however is unadaptable to, for example, classical Athens. When addressing a society where human traffic is legal and socially sanctioned, where slaves can be used at the pleasure of their masters with virtually no possible consequence and where women are always under male power, of either their father, brother or husband, an argument based on consent ceases to make sense.

The rationale underpinning the concept of paraphilias in the *DSM* does not rely so heavily on the matter of consent, but rather on the notion of normal and abnormal sexual

desires. But what is 'normal' and 'not normal' sex? This is a question to which the editors of the *DSM*, after five editions and almost seventy years of research, are still struggling to provide an answer. In the first edition (1952), the category was listed as "sexual deviation", and defined as "deviant sexuality which is not symptomatic of more extensive syndrome",[9] not providing a proper definition concerning the meaning of "deviant". The second edition, published in 1968, maintained the same designation, specifying that it referred to "sexual acts not usually associated with coitus, or toward coitus performed under bizarre circumstances".[10] Already at this early edition of the manual it is perceivable that the psychological definition of deviant sexual behaviour is amply based on the western social perception of correct sexual behaviour. As Wiederman (2003: 316) noted, the application of the term "bizarre", at the time, was a value judgement on the part of the writers. At that point, the conception of abnormal sexual behaviour most likely included masturbation, oral and anal sex (Wiederman 2003: 316; Moser 2001: 96), practices that the statistics show are among the most common sexual activities today.[11] There was not a great change in that particular vision after a decade, when the third edition of the *DSM* (1980) was published, and where the term paraphilia made its debut in the *DSM*. Here, paraphilias are characterized by their non "normative arousal-activity patterns", and that the "essential feature of disorders in this subclass is that unusual or bizarre imagery or acts are necessary for sexual excitement".[12] The use of terms such as "unusual" and "bizarre" is meant to establish the difference between the sexual behaviours that were part

[9] *DSM-I* 1952: 38-39
[10] *DSM-II*, 1968: 44.
[11] The CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), concerning the American population, states that oral and anal sex are rising in popularity. In 2002, 83% of the men in analyses stated that they had oral sex with a person of the opposite sex, and 82% of women said the same. This numbers decreased in the following years but remain more than 80%. Concerning anal sex, the tendency suffered a slow rise in its popularity. In 2002, 34% of the men and 30% of the women referred that they had engaged in anal sex with a person of the opposite gender. The numbers rose in the following years, 37% in the 2006-2010 period, and 38.9% in 2011-2013 for men; 31.6% in 2006-2010 and 33.1% in 2011-2013 for women. Therefore, we may consider that the stigma associated with these practices has disappeared in the last fifty years.
[12] *DSM-III* 1980: 261-266.

of the socially accepted concept of normal sex of the time, from the behaviours that were not socially sanctioned.[13]

Contrary to the previous editions, the *DSM-IV* (1994) brought considerable developments to the conceptualization of paraphilias, defining them as "recurrent, intense sexual urges, fantasies, or behaviors that involve unusual objects, activities, or situations and cause clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning".[14] In this new edition there was an attempt to separate paraphilia from the non-pathological use of sexual fantasies. The emphasis on "bizarre", "unusual" or "normative sexual interests" was removed, to avoid the problem of having to define what normal and abnormal sexual behaviour are (Hinderliter 2010: 250-251). However, by avoiding dealing with these definitions, they created a criterion so wide that, as Moser (2001: 97) expressed, it makes almost everyone capable of being diagnosed with a paraphilic disorder. The *DSM-V* (2013) did not present a solution to this problem. It defines paraphilias as "any intense and persistent sexual interest other than sexual interest in genital stimulation or preparatory fondling with phenotypically normal, physically mature, consenting human partners".[15] In this edition, the diagnosed paraphilias are voyeurism, exhibitionism, frotteurism, masochism, sadism, paedophilia, fetishism, and transvestism. Despite that the *DSM-V* should present a renewed vision on this subject, the truth is that the same problems remain. As Ross (2015: 198) recently noticed, it is hard to understand how fetishism and cross-dressing are still listed, on an equal level with paedophilia. Like homosexuality, which was removed from the list in

[13] The *DSM-III* clearly states that only persons that were exclusively aroused by certain fantasies, considered abnormal, could be diagnosed. This premise was quickly discarded since, at the time of the revision of the third edition (1987), there was already evidence that individuals who were diagnosed with a paraphilic disorder were also responsive to more conventional sexual stimulus (Moser 2001: 96; Wiederman 2003: 316). On this conclusion we may also discern the influence of the studies of Money, which connected the development of an individual's paraphilia with his process of sexual evolution since puberty and a treatment approach that combines hormonal antiandrogenic treatment with counselling therapy. Money's work was influential on the development of the concept of paraphilia in the following decades, and on the evolution of its pathological diagnosis.

[14] *DSM-IV* 1994: 493

[15] *DSM-V* 2013: 685

DSM-III, these two categories, that are not considered a crime and do not have a victim, should have already disappeared. The reason for this is, once again, directly connected with social standards. In 1973, the change in the definition of homosexuality and its diagnosis was imminent. The new standard considered that homosexuality could not be considered a mental disorder because "many homosexual individuals were socially functional and not distressed by their homosexuality" (Hinderliter 2010: 244). Contesting this theory, Irving Bieber stated that, according to this parameter, voyeurism and fetishism could not be considered mental disorders either. This contestation was answered by Robert Spitzer, one of the main forces behind the reformulation of the *DSM*:

> "I haven't given as much thought [as Dr. Bieber] to the problems of voyeurism and fetishism, and perhaps that's because the voyeurists and fetishists haven't organized themselves and forced us to do that".[16]

Spitzer's response shows that he was forced to promote a change in the *DSM* to correspond to the growing influence of the gay community. Its removal was a political act, in face of the considerable growth of the LGBT movement in the United States. Western civilization was on the verge of a social and sexual revolution, which influenced a major change of mentality.

This short incursion into the history of the *DSM* and the development of the concept of paraphilias was necessary to understand the evolution of the social mores of 20th-21st century western civilization, and that the concept of normal and abnormal sex is extremely dynamic, forever modifiable due to the continued development of societies. It becomes even clearer if we compare the sexual mores of the western 21st century civilization, with the sexual mores of other modern societies. According to statistics by

[16] Hinderliter 2010: 244.

the United Nations Population Fund,[17] child marriage, and consequential sexual activity is still accepted and widely practised in some African societies, while in most Western societies sexual activity between an adult and a child will be considered an act of paedophilia, and liable to criminal prosecution. In societies where this action is legally and socially sanctioned, this behaviour is considered normal, therefore it could not fit the parameters set for diagnosing paraphilias, since the *DSM-V* fundaments the diagnosis criteria on the notion that a certain behaviour is against the norm. When it becomes the social norm, it can no longer be considered a crime or a mental disorder. In short, if sex between adults and children was socially accepted and practised in every society of the world, there would be no paedophilia or paedophiles.

Although it is impossible to pick up the *DSM* and analyse an ancient society through its criteria, the rationale behind the evolution of the concept of paraphilias is similar to the one behind the ancient Greeks' notion of normal and abnormal sex. If one specific sexual activity does not fit the general sexual behaviour that is condoned by the majority of the population – or at least the ones that held the social power - that sexual activity is deemed as transgressive, against nature and social mores. By exploring the ancient Greeks' conception of rightful and lawful sexual behaviour, we can perceive the actions that fall outside of this spectrum, and therefore that go against the norm. By exploring the 'normal', 'natural' behaviour, we can more easily identify the 'unnatural'. And, in fact, we have accounts by different ancient authors where their perception of right and wrong sexual behaviour is explained. In Herodotus' story of Gyges and Candaules, we have the description of one sexual behaviour that is against custom:

οὗτος δὴ ὧν ὁ Κανδαύλης ἠράσθη τῆς ἑωυτοῦ γυναικός, ἐρασθεὶς δὲ ἐνόμιζέ οἱ εἶναι γυναῖκα πολλὸν πασέων καλλίστην. ὥστε δὲ ταῦτα νομίζων, ἦν γάρ οἱ τῶν αἰχμοφόρων Γύγης ὁ Δασκύλου ἀρεσκόμενος μάλιστα, τούτῳ τῷ Γύγῃ καὶ τὰ σπουδαιέστερα τῶν πρηγμάτων ὑπερετίθετο ὁ Κανδαύλης καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς γυναικὸς ὑπερεπαινέων. χρόνου δὲ οὐ πολλοῦ διελθόντος （χρῆν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς ） ἔλεγε πρὸς τὸν Γύγην τοιάδε. 'Γύγη, οὐ γὰρ σε δοκέω πείθεσθαι μοι λέγοντι περὶ τοῦ εἴδεος τῆς γυναικός

[17] The information is available in their website: www.unfpa.org/child-marriage.

（ὦτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἐόντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν）, ποίεε ὅκως ἐκείνην θεήσεαι γυμνήν.’ ὃ δ’ ἀμβώσας εἶπε ‘δέσποτα, τίνα λέγεις λόγον οὐκ ὑγιέα, κελεύων με δέσποιναν τὴν ἐμὴν θεήσασθαι γυμνήν; ἅμα δὲ κιθῶνι ἐκδυομένῳ συνεκδύεται καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ γυνή. πάλαι δὲ τὰ καλὰ ἀνθρώποισι ἐξεύρηται, ἐκ τῶν μανθάνειν δεῖ: ἐν τοῖσι ἓν τόδε ἐστί, σκοπέειν τινὰ τὰ ἑωυτοῦ. ἐγὼ δὲ πείθομαι ἐκείνην εἶναι πασέων γυναικῶν καλλίστην, καὶ σέο δέομαι μὴ δέεσθαι ἀνόμων.’

This Candaules, then, fell in love with his own wife, so much so that he believed her to be by far the most beautiful woman in the world; and believing this, he praised her beauty beyond measure to Gyges son of Dascylus, who was his favorite among his bodyguard; for it was to Gyges that he entrusted all his most important secrets. After a little while, Candaules, doomed to misfortune, spoke to Gyges thus: “Gyges, I do not think that you believe what I say about the beauty of my wife; men trust their ears less than their eyes: so you must see her naked.” Gyges protested loudly at this. “Master,” he said, “what kind of a sick suggestion, that I should see my mistress naked! When a woman's clothes come off, she dispenses with her modesty, too. Men have long ago made wise rules from which one ought to learn; one of these is that one should mind one's own business. As for me, I believe that your queen is the most beautiful of all women, and I ask you not to ask of me what is lawless." [18]

The story conveys how secretly looking at a naked woman, and specifically one woman that is not under the control of the beholder, not being his wife, is against the social norm, against the accepted sexual behaviour.[19]

We also find references to abnormal sexual activities in the works of Plato, namely in the *Republic* and the *Laws*. While somewhat different in style and content, both dialogues focus on the construction of the ideal city. As Laks (1990: 211) has noted, “Πολιτεία and Νόμοι, the Greek words for what we call the Republic and the Laws, are complementary titles”. One of the major differences is the reference to legislation in the *Laws*, which does not happen in the *Republic*. References to sexual activities that are abnormal or against nature, however, is one similarity that the two dialogues share. In the ninth book of Plato’s *Republic*, in which the author addresses tyrannical power and the tyrant’s personality, Socrates’ character describes a number of pleasurable activites that are *paranomoi* (9.571b-d):

[…] τῶν μὴ ἀναγκαίων ἡδονῶν τε καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν δοκοῦσί τινές μοι εἶναι παράνομοι, αἳ κινδυνεύουσι μὲν ἐγγίγνεσθαι παντί, κολαζόμεναι δὲ ὑπό τε τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν βελτιόνων ἐπιθυμιῶν μετὰ λόγου ἐνίων μὲν ἀνθρώπων ἢ παντάπασιν ἀπαλλάττεσθαι ἢ ὀλίγαι λείπεσθαι καὶ ἀσθενεῖς, [571ξ] τῶν δὲ ἰσχυρότεραι καὶ πλείους. λέγεις δὲ καὶ τίνας, ἔφη, ταύτας; τὰς περὶ τὸν ὕπνον, ἦν δ’ ἐγώ, ἐγειρομένας, ὅταν τὸ μὲν ἄλλο τῆς ψυχῆς εὕδῃ, ὅσον λογιστικὸν καὶ ἥμερον καὶ ἄρχον ἐκείνου, τὸ δὲ θηριῶδές τε καὶ ἄγριον, ἢ σίτων ἢ μέθης πλησθέν, σκιρτᾷ τε καὶ ἀπωσάμενον τὸν ὕπνον ζητῇ ἰέναι καὶ ἀποπιμπλάναι τὰ αὐτοῦ ἤθη: οἶσθ’ ὅτι πάντα

[18] Hdt. 1.8. Tr. Godley.
[19] I analyse this episode in detail in chapter 1.

ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ τολμᾷ ποιεῖν, ὡς ἀπὸ πάσης λελυμένον τε καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένον αἰσχύνης καὶ φρονήσεως. μητρί τε γὰρ ἐπιχειρεῖν [571δ] μείγνυσθαι, ὡς οἴεται, οὐδὲν ὀκνεῖ, ἄλλῳ τε ὁτῳοῦν ἀνθρώπων καὶ θεῶν καὶ θηρίων, μιαιφονεῖν τε ὁτιοῦν, βρώματός τε ἀπέχεσθαι μηδενός: καὶ ἑνὶ λόγῳ οὔτε ἀνοίας οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει οὔτ᾽ ἀναισχυντίας.

[…] Of our unnecessary pleasures and appetites there are some lawless ones, I think, which probably are to be found in us all, but which, when controlled by the laws and the better desires in alliance with reason, can in some men be altogether got rid of, or so nearly so that only a few weak ones remain, [571c] while in others the remnant is stronger and more numerous." "What desires do you mean?" he said. "Those," said I, "that are awakened in sleep when the rest of the soul, the rational, gentle and dominant part, slumbers, but the beastly and savage part, full of food and wine, comes alive and, repelling sleep, endeavours to sally forth and satisfy its own instincts. You are aware that in such case there is nothing it will not venture to undertake as being released from all sense of shame and all reason. It does not shrink from attempting to have sex with a mother [571d] in fancy or with anyone else, man, god or beast. It is ready for any foul deed of blood; it abstains from no food, and, in a word, falls short of no extreme of folly and shamelessness."[20]

Socrates' reference to unnecessary pleasures in this passage, which is related to a previous point of the discussion (8.558d), where it was argued that desires that a man cannot in any way avoid, such as eating the necessary food to sustain one's body, are necessary, and desires that one can and should avoid, such as eating other foods than the ones the body specifically needs (such as bread) are unnecessary. In the passage quoted above, Socrates provides more examples of unnecessary appetites, specifically sexual ones that are lawless, apart from the normal behaviour. Namely, sex with one's mother, gods or animals. It is implied that sex against the norm is any type of sexual activity that breaks familiar (mother) and sacred (gods) boundaries, as well as inter-species boundaries (animals).

In the Book I of the *Laws* (1.636b-c), Plato's final speech set in Crete in the fourth century B.C.E. the three characters get involved in a discussion regarding the customs of Sparta and Crete, including sexual activities that were not so much beyond convention, but rather against nature itself (*kata physin*):

τὰ δὲ καὶ ὠφελοῦν. ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ γυμνάσια ταῦτα καὶ τὰ συσσίτια πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα νῦν ὠφελεῖ τὰς πόλεις, πρὸς δὲ τὰς στάσεις χαλεπά—δηλοῦσιν δὲ Μιλησίων καὶ Βοιωτῶν καὶ Θουρίων παῖδες—καὶ δὴ καὶ παλαιὸν νόμον δοκεῖ τοῦτο τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα καὶ κατὰ φύσιν, τὰς περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια ἡδονὰς οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καὶ θηρίων, διεφθαρκέναι. καὶ τούτων τὰς ὑμετέρας πόλεις πρώτας ἄν τις αἰτιῷτο καὶ [636ξ] ὅσαι τῶν ἄλλων μάλιστα ἅπτονται τῶν γυμνασίων: καὶ εἴτε παίζοντα εἴτε σπουδάζοντα ἐννοεῖν δεῖ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἐννοητέον ὅτι τῇ θηλείᾳ καὶ τῇ τῶν ἀρρένων φύσει εἰς κοινωνίαν ἰούσῃ τῆς γεννήσεως ἡ περὶ ταῦτα ἡδονὴ κατὰ φύσιν ἀποδεδόσθαι δοκεῖ, ἀρρένων δὲ πρὸς ἄρρενας ἢ θηλειῶν πρὸς θηλείας παρὰ φύσιν καὶ τῶν πρώτων τὸ τόλμημ᾽ εἶναι δι᾽ ἀκράτειαν ἡδονῆς.

[20] Tr. Shorey slighted adapted.

So these common meals, for example, and these gymnasia, while they are at present beneficial to the States in many other respects, yet in the event of civil strife they prove dangerous (as is shown by the case of the youth of Miletus, Boeotia and Thurii); and, moreover, this institution, when of old standing, is thought to have corrupted the pleasures of love which are natural not to men only but also natural to beasts. For this your States are held primarily responsible, and along with them all others [636c] that especially encourage the use of gymnasia. And whether one makes the observation in earnest or in jest, one certainly should not fail to observe that when male unites with female for procreation the pleasure experienced is held to be due to nature, but contrary to nature when male mates with male or female with female, and that those first guilty of such enormities were impelled by their slavery to pleasure.[21]

In the *Laws*, love between two men, either two adults or in a pederastic setting, is branded as sexual behaviour against nature, both human and animal. This idea is reemphasised by the Athenian to Clinias in a later passage of the text (8.836c):

γάρ τις ἀκολουθῶν τῇ φύσει θήσει τὸν πρὸ τοῦ Λαΐου νόμον, λέγων ὡς ὀρθῶς εἶχεν τὸ τῶν ἀρρένων καὶ νέων μὴ κοινωνεῖν καθάπερ θηλειῶν πρὸς μεῖξιν ἀφροδισίων, μάρτυρα παραγόμενος τὴν τῶν θηρίων φύσιν καὶ δεικνὺς πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐχ ἁπτόμενον ἄρρενα ἄρρενος διὰ τὸ μὴ φύσει τοῦτο εἶναι, τάχ᾽ ἂν χρῷτο πιθανῷ λόγῳ, καὶ ταῖς ὑμετέραις πόλεσιν οὐδαμῶς συμφωνοῖ.

If we were to follow in nature's steps and enact that law which held good before the days of Laius, declaring that it is right to refrain from indulging in the same kind of intercourse with men and boys as with women, and adducing as evidence thereof the nature of wild beasts, and pointing out how male does not touch male for this purpose, since it is unnatural - in all this we would probably be using an argument neither convincing nor in any way consonant with your States.[22]

Once again, the Athenian states that sex between men is not according to nature (φύσις) and re-uses the comparison between human and animal nature. He emphasises that animals do not engage in sexual intercourse between males, since it is not natural (μὴ φύσει). This correlation between human and animal homoerotic behaviour, as an example of sexual behaviour against nature, is also made by Plutarch in the *Moralia* in the essay *Beasts are Rational* (990d-f):

ὅθεν οὔτ᾽ ἄρρενος πρὸς ἄρρεν οὔτε θήλεος πρὸς θῆλυ μῖξιν αἱ τῶν θηρίων ἐπιθυμίαι μέχρι γε νῦν ἐνηνόχασιν. ὑμῶν δὲ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν σεμνῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν· ἐῶ γὰρ τοὺς οὐδενὸς ἀξίους· ὁ δ᾽ Ἀγαμέμνων τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἐπῆλθε κυνηγετῶν τὸν Ἄργυννον ὑποφεύγοντα καὶ καταψευδόμενος τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ Ετῶν πνευμάτων . . . εἶτα καλὸν καλῶς ἑαυτὸν βαπτίζων εἰς τὴν Κωπαΐδα λίμνην, ὡς αὐτόθι κατασβέσων τὸν ἔρωτα καὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαλλαξόμενος. ὁ δ᾽ Ἡρακλῆς ὁμοίως ἑταῖρον ἀγένειον ἐπιδιώκων ἀπελείφθη τῶν ἀριστέων καὶ προύδωκε τὸν στόλον· ἐν δὲ τῇ θόλῳ τοῦ Πτῴου Ἀπόλλωνος λαθών τις ὑμῶν ἐνέγραψεν "Ἀχιλλεὺς καλός," ἤδη τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως υἱὸν ἔχοντος· καὶ τὰ γράμματα πυνθάνομαι διαμένειν. ἀλεκτρυὼν δ᾽ ἀλεκτρυόνος ἐπιβαίνων, θηλείας μὴ παρούσης, καταπίμπραται ζωός, μάντεώς τινος ἢ τερατοσκόπου μέγα καὶ δεινὸν ἀποφαίνοντος εἶναι τὸ γινόμενον. οὕτω καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀνωμολόγηται τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι μᾶλλον τοῖς θηρίοις σωφρονεῖν προσήκει καὶ μὴ παραβιάζεσθαι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς τὴν φύσιν. τὰ δ᾽ ἐν ὑμῖν

[21] Tr. Bury.
[22] Tr. Bury.

ἀκόλαστα οὐδὲ τὸν νόμον ἔχουσα σύμμαχον ἡ φύσις ἐντὸς ὅρων καθείργνυσιν, ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ ὑπὸ ῥεύματος ἐκφερόμενα πολλαχοῦ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις δεινὴν ὕβριν καὶ ταραχὴν καὶ σύγχυσιν ἐν τοῖς ἀφροδισίοις ἀπεργάζεται τῆς φύσεως. καὶ γὰρ αἰγῶν ἐπειράθησαν ἄνδρες καὶ ὑῶν καὶ ἵππων μιγνύμενοι καὶ γυναῖκες ἄρρεσι θηρίοις ἐπεμάνησαν· ἐκ γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων γάμων ὑμῖν Μινώταυροι καὶ Αἰγίπανες, ὡς δ᾽ ἐγῷμαι καὶ Σφίγγες ἀναβλαστάνουσι καὶ Κένταυροι. καίτοι διὰ λιμόν ποτ᾽ ἀνθρώπου καὶ κύων ἔφαγεν καὶ ὑπ᾽ ἀνάγκης ὄρνις ἀπεγεύσατο· πρὸς δὲ συνουσίαν οὐδέποτε θηρίον ἐπεχείρησεν ἀνθρώπῳ χρήσασθαι. θηρία δ᾽ ἄνθρωποι καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ πρὸς ἄλλα πολλὰ καθ᾽ ἡδονὰς βιάζονται καὶ παρανομοῦσιν.

Whence it comes about that to this very day the desires of beasts have encompassed no same-sex mating. But you have a fair amount of such trafficking among your high and mighty nobility, to say nothing of the baser sort. Agamemnon came to Boeotia hunting for Argynnus, who tried to elude him, and slandering the sea and winds . . . then he gave his noble self a noble bath in Lake Copaïs to drown his passion there and get rid of his desire. Just so Heracles, pursuing a beardless lad, lagged behind the other heroes and deserted the expedition. On the Rotunda of Ptoian Apollo one of your men secretly inscribed FAIR IS ACHILLES — when Achilles already had a son. And I hear that the inscription is still in place. But a cock that mounts another for the lack of a female is burned alive because some prophet or seer declares that such an event is an important and terrible omen. On this basis even men themselves acknowledge that beasts have a better claim to temperance and the non-violation of nature in their pleasures. Not even Nature, with Law for her ally, can keep within bounds the unchastened vice of your [men] hearts; but as though swept by the current of their lusts beyond the barrier at many points, men do such deeds as wantonly outrage Nature, upset her order, and confuse her distinctions. For men have, in fact, attempted to consort with goats and sows and mares, and women have gone mad with lust for male beasts. From such unions your Minotaurs and Aegipans, and, I suppose, your Sphinxes and Centaurs have arisen. Yet it is through hunger that dogs have occasionally eaten a man; and birds have tasted of human flesh through necessity; but no beast has ever attempted a human body for lustful reasons. But the beasts I have mentioned and many others have been victims of the violent and lawless lusts of man.[23]

In this passage, Gryllus, one of Odysseus' companions who was transformed into a pig by Circe, argues why he does not wish to be returned to the form of a man. He now understands that animals are purer beings than humans, partly because they do not succumb to or pursue other pleasures than the ones set by nature, like humans do. Among those unnatural pleasures, he lists the desire for men to have sex with other men. Gryllus not only stresses how unnatural this desire is, but also unlawful, *anomos*, arguing that homoerotic behaviour was a transgression against human (and animal) nature, as well as human law.[24]

A similar argument is expressed in Plutarch's *Amatorius* (751c-e):

[23] Tr. Helmbold. I explore this text in section 5 of the third chapter. Helmbold chose to use the term 'homosexual', however, I believe 'same-sex' is a more appropriate translation.

[24] As Hubbard (2009: 253) notes, "Zoological observation had not progressed sufficiently in the ancient world to recognize that homosexual coitus was actually widespread among many mammals, and especially among primate species […]".

ἐγὼ δὲ παμμέγεθες τοῦτο ποιοῦμαι σημεῖον ὑπὲρ τῶν γυναικῶν εἰ γὰρ ἡ παρὰ φύσιν ὁμιλία πρὸς ἄρρενας οὐκ ἀναιρεῖ τὴν ἐρωτικὴν εὔνοιαν οὐδὲ βλάπτει, πολὺ μᾶλλον εἰκός ἐστι τὸν γυναικῶν ἢ ἀνδρῶν ἔρωτα τῇ φύσει χρώμενον εἰς φιλίαν διὰ χάριτος ἐξικνεῖσθαι. [...] ἡ δ᾽ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρρένων ἀκόντων μὲν μετὰ βίας γενομένη καὶ λεηλασίας, ἂν δ᾽ ἑκουσίως, σὺν μαλακίᾳ καὶ θηλύτητι, ‘βαίνεσθαι’ κατὰ Πλάτωνα ‘νόμῳ τετράποδος καὶ παιδοσπορεῖσθαι’ παρὰ φύσιν ἐνδιδόντων, ἄχαρις χάρις παντάπασι καὶ ἀσχήμων καὶ ἀναφρόδιτος.

But I count this as a great argument in favour of women: if union contrary to nature with males does not destroy or curtail a lover's tenderness, it stands to reason that the love between men and women, being normal and natural, will be conducive to friendship developing in due course from favour. […] But to consort with males (whether without consent, in which case it involves violence and brigandage; or if with consent, there is still weakness and effeminacy on the part of those who, contrary to nature, allow themselves in Plato's words - 'to be covered and mounted like cattle' – this is a completely ill-favoured favour, indecent, an unlovely affront to Aphrodite.[25]

Once again, Plutarch establishes sex between men as a union contrary to nature, (παρὰ φύσιν), here contrasting it with sex between men and women (γυναικῶν ἢ ἀνδρῶν ἔρωτα τῇ φύσει). But crucially, these are not by any means views consistently shared by all ancient authors, of course – and, famously, in his earlier dialogues, Plato himself frequently uses pederastic models to explore philosophical themes (e.g. and esp. *Symposium* and *Timaeus*, albeit with positive emphasis on the non-physical as opposed to the sexual elements of such relationships). And while the institution of pederasty clearly underwent some form of public relations crisis in the fourth century BC in Athens (plausibly as an aristocratic institution coming under increasing scrutiny in a democratic city-state),[26] there is little reason to doubt the opening assertion of Dover in *Greek Homosexuality* that there was 'a sympathetic response to the open expression of homosexual desire' in Greek culture[27] – though the forty years' of scholarship since the publication of this book have continued to add nuance to this statement and, of course, challenge the appropriateness of the modern term 'homosexual' in discussions of ancient sexual behaviour world. Considering the context of this thesis, which aims to explore a set of sexual activities deemed has transgressive by ancient authors and until now underexplored by classical scholarship, I have therefore chosen not to discuss same-sex

[25] Tr. Helmbold.
[26] For an overview of scholarly debates, see Robson 2013: 49-52
[27] Dover 1978: 1.

sexual acts in detail. I do however, briefly explore pederasty and same-sex male relationships in chapter two.

Similar to the examples already provided, at the end of the first book of the *Oneirocritica*, Artemidorus explores sex contrary to nature (παρά φύσιν συνουσίας), and under this category he lists dreams where a person is having sex with himself, oral sex, women penetrating women, having sex with a god or goddess (especially nasty if one dreams of having sex with Artemis, Athena, Hestia, Rhea, Hera or Hecate), having sex with a dead person (νεκρῷ δέ μιγῆναι) or with a wild beast (θηρίῳ μιγῆναι). Although these dreams are listed under the category of sex contrary to nature, they do not automatically mean that something terrible will happen. In fact, dreaming of having sex with an animal might be positive, if the person is the one mounting the animal. Supposedly, this would mean that the dreamer would benefit, in some way, from a person who is similar to the dreamt beast. However, if the dreamer is the one being penetrated by the animal, that can mean that he will suffer immensely, and possibly die. Therefore, when Artemidorus mentions intercourse contrary to nature, he is implying that these sexual activities are considered wrong by the society of his time.

It is clear that ancient Greek authors, centuries apart from each other, discussed sexual activities that, at least in their opinion, are against human nature, against what society deems as proper sexual behaviour, or both. Like today, what is 'normal' is what the majority of the population practices, and what does not fit this matrix is branded as a deviation. Among the sexual behaviours above mentioned, we find references to the four that I explore in this thesis. When reading through each individual chapter, it becomes clear that these four sexual activities share various traits. One of the major similarities between these four practices is that their primary outcome is not reproduction. In the cases where reproduction is attested, the progeny is monstrous. The main function of Greek marriage is to procreate, producing children, especially male children that will be the future citizens of the city and warriors in the army. One of the most famous statements of

the relevance of marriage in Greek, and particularly Athenian society, is found in Apollodorus speech against Neaira (Dem. 59.122):

> […] τὸ γὰρ συνοικεῖν τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν, ὃς ἂν παιδοποιῆται καὶ εἰσάγῃ εἴς τε τοὺς φράτερας καὶ δημότας τοὺς υἱεῖς, καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ἐκδιδῷ ὡς αὑτοῦ οὔσας τοῖς ἀνδράσι. τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἑταίρας ἡδονῆς ἕνεκ᾽ ἔχομεν, τὰς δὲ παλλακὰς τῆς καθ᾽ ἡμέραν θεραπείας τοῦ σώματος, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τοῦ παιδοποιεῖσθαι γνησίως καὶ τῶν ἔνδον φύλακα πιστὴν ἔχειν.
>
> [...] For this is what living with a woman as one's wife means—to have children by her and to introduce the sons to the members of the clan and of the deme, and to betroth the daughters to husbands as one's own. Mistresses we keep for the sake of pleasure, concubines for the daily care of our persons, but wives to bear us legitimate children and to be faithful guardians of our households.[28]

Apollodorus asserts the appropriate, socially approved behaviour and function of the legitimate wife, reemphasising the relevance of procreation in an ancient society. Not only procreation, but legitimate, socially accepted reproduction. Although the passage highlights the right that the ancient Greek man had to seek pleasure with other women, it nevertheless emphasises the social sanctioned, therefore legitimate, way of reproducing in an ancient society, leaving aside any other possibility for the upbringing of rightful children. Therefore, there was considerable pressure and anxiety surrounding procreation, and this is quite perceptible in the story of Pisistratus and Megacles' daughter, as told by Herodotus (1.61). According to the historian, upon returning to Athens, Pisistratus married Megacles' daughter. However, since he already had sons and considering that there were rumours of a curse upon the Alcmeonid family, Pisistratus tried to avoid having children with his new wife, by having unusual intercourse (κατὰ νόμον). As Asheri (2007: 105, 124) points out, although this expression is often used by Herodotus as a reference to 'custom', here it is used as 'rule', i.e. sex that does not follow the rules of intercourse between husband and wife – which should lead to reproduction – and so most likely a reference to anal sex. This fact would eventually be known by Megacles, who consequently allied with the opposite faction, led by Lycurgus, forcing Pisistratus to

[28] Tr. Murray.

flee. In this particular case, the attempt to avoid procreation within a legally sanctioned marriage eventually led to several years in exile.

This particular tale, although clearly a hyperbolized episode, is an example of the relevance of procreative sex in ancient Greek society. Similar to the sexual act described by Herodotus, sexual visual transgression, sexual abuse of prepubescent children, sex with animals and sex with corpses in general do not permit human reproduction. It is useless for the propagation of the species, with no positive contribution to society. This does not imply that Greeks did not engage in sex just for pleasure, as they certainly did. However, this would generally involve sex with other living, mature humans, which in general bears reproductive potential (although that might not be the intention) not breaking any natural, inter-species, boundaries (an exception here being same-sex relationships, which although widely accepted in Greek culture nevertheless occasionally came under scrutiny from some authors, as we saw above). Ancient sources also refer sexual transgressions that could lead to reproduction, such as sex with a direct family member – although depending on the family member and most likely without reproduction being the primary reason behind the sexual act. However, the four sexual activities that I explore in this thesis do not naturally lead to reproduction, apart from one particular case. In the single example of reproduction through one of these sexual activities, Pasiphae gave birth to the minotaur, a hybrid creature that embodies the transgression of nature that was committed. As I explore in chapter 3, the mythological cycle of the minotaur would eventually correct this sexual wrongdoing, with the help of Ariadne, Pasiphae's 'natural' daughter.

Another major similarity between these four sexual behaviours is, as already mentioned, different ancient authors already discussed them as transgressive sexual acts, deeming them as specific sexual behaviours that did not fit the social norm. Herodotus classifies Candaules and Gyges' behaviour as *anomos*, in the *Laws* is conveyed a perspective of unnatural sex between two men, Plutarch makes references to unnatural

sex between humans and animals, and Artemidorus classifies sex with corpses as sex contrary to nature. Another similarity is that the seriousness of the transgression is subject to the social status of the people involved. For example, Gyges' actions are particularly terrible, and deserving of punishment, because the naked woman is the queen. If Gyges had secretly watched a woman of lesser social status, this story mostly likely would not have survived to our day. The same thing is observable in examples of sexual abuse of children. If the victim was a son or daughter of a distinguished citizen, chances are that it would be treated as a serious offence; while the violation of a slave child would have a different outcome. Since we know of children that were raised to become prostitutes, it would likely be common to have prepubescent boys and girls in the brothels, at the disposal of any client. Herodotus tells how in Egypt the corpses of wives of important men, and beautiful women of high repute, should be given to the embalmers only three or four days after they passed away. Supposedly, there was one embalmer that had been caught having intercourse with the corpse of one of these women. The implementation of an obligatory waiting period would allow the corpse to start the decomposition process, and therefore it would be less sexually appealing to the embalmers. Herodotus clearly states that this custom focuses on high-status women, while what might happen to the corpses of low-status women is not conveyed. The social hierarchy is relevant even when the sources convey an example of transgressive sex among low-status people. In Theocritus' *Song of Thyrsis*, Priapus compares Daphnis, a cowherd, to a goatherd who sexually fantasises about his goats. The goatherd was considered a lower-class of herdsmen, therefore the lower-social status is here connected to the sexual transgression.

The relevance of social status when addressing sexual transgressions is also clear in myth. Gods and goddesses are above men in the natural and social order of the world, therefore they are permitted to do things that humans are not allowed to do. Looking at a naked goddess, when she does not wish to be seen, is even more transgressive than looking at a queen, as we can perceive from the myths of Actaeon and Tiresias. Leda and

Europa are not punished for having intercourse with a swan and a bull, because it was Zeus in animal form. On the contrary, Pasiphae only reaped misfortune from her sexual encounter with an actual bull. These myths not only reassert the natural social hierarchy of the universe, but also how abnormal sexual desires could lead to a transgression against the gods.

Therefore, the notion of abnormal sex in ancient Greece is not only rooted in the Greeks' perception of what normal sex should be – a socially constructed concept – but it is also mutable and nuanced concerning the social position of the people involved. Comprehending the power dynamics of ancient societies, is crucial to understanding how a specific occurrence of a sexual act would be generally considered and socially judged. Therefore, to correctly approach para-normal sex in ancient Greece, we have to look beyond the sexual act *per se*, and understand the society, its codes of conduct, religion and social organization. This is what I do in each chapter, as I explain in the following section.

0.2 Methodology

As already stated, in the following four chapters I explore four sexual activities that were considered transgressive in ancient Greece. I have already argued that by 'transgressive' I imply sexual activities that ancient Greek sources deems as against nature and against the norm. I start each chapter with an analysis of the terminology and literature on the subject. As I show in those analyses, when classical scholars focus on this subject there is a tendency to apply modern terms that are commonly used in psychology scholarship. In the cases that I explore in this thesis, the most used terms are the ones provided in the paraphilias section of the *DSM*, such as voyeurism, paedophilia, zoophilia (or in some cases bestiality) and necrophilia. I believe that application of

modern terms, especially when the author does not provide their own definition of the terms they choose to use, consequently produces anachronistic conclusions, or at least misguides the reader. To avoid this, I chose to coin my own terms for each practice. Therefore, when reading 'sexual visual transgression' or 'child sexual abuse' I am in no way making a reference to voyeurism or paedophilia. These two sexual activities are very well defined in today's world, from psychological and legal perspectives. In the four examples of sexual transgressions that I explore in this thesis, I only found evidence that might provide legal and psychological readings in regard to one, child sexual abuse. Even in this case, the evidence is not enough to be conclusive. Therefore, by coining a new term for each practice I am establishing terminology that enables the discussion of these activities that can be found in ancient Greek societies, without the risk of anachronistic readings.

After the initial discussion of the terminology, I move to discuss the general social context relevant for understanding the transgressional practice. In the first chapter, I explore ancient Greek theories of vision, and how they connected the eyes with active sexual desire. In the second chapter, I explore the concept of child in ancient Greece, specifically the age from when they are considered ready to become sexually active, this way separating them from children with whom sexual intercourse was transgressive. In the third chapter I explore the concept of animal, asserting which contact between human and animal was socially accepted, separating it from transgressive sexual contact. In the fourth chapter I explore the correct behaviour that one should have towards a cadaver. By asserting the proper behaviour in each of these cases, defining what was 'normal' for the Greeks, it is easier to show how the sexual behaviours that I am approaching are transgressive.

I then move to the analyses of the sources that convey descriptions of the transgressions. Here, I include both mythological and non-mythological evidence. As I already stated, some of the specific examples of these transgressions are provided in

mythological sources, crossing sexual transgression with religious transgression. This is particularly perceptible in chapter 1 and 3, where I explore, among others, the myths of Actaeon, Tiresias, Europa and Pasiphae. Like James Robson (2002: 65),[29] I treat myths as conveyers of moral perceptions of ancient Greek societies. This is not a new take on mythology, as various authors have already discussed the educational value of ancient myths, how they convey the moral conduct of their societies. Mary Lefkowitz (1986: xviii), whom Robson quotes as his precursor on this approach, expressed the idea that myths were "retold both for entertainment and for instruction". Livingston (2011: 125), in a similar way, argued that myths are "more than just stories: they encapsulate something about the way the world should (or should not) be". Eire and Velasco López (2012: 63) also recognize the importance of myths as conveyers of social conduct. To them, myth plays a politico-social and educational primordial function, based on language that contains common, collective representations (both positive and negative), always shared by the community, that partake of myths as they partake of language.[30] Myths carried educational value, teaching how one should, and should not, behave. As will become clear, the ancient Greeks could learn of appropriate and inappropriate social and sexual conduct from the myths of Tiresias, Actaeon or Pasiphae. The relevance of mythology as a conveyer of morality and boundaries to be respected, is noted across the entire thesis. I chose not to restrict myself to analyse sources of one specific period, geography or genre, instead exploring a diverse set of sources, from Homer to Nonnos. This way, I was able to explore as many examples of these sexual transgressions as I could find, although when analysing them I always took into consideration the author, the period in which they were written, the genre and specific context. I find it extremely

[29] First published in 1997.

[30] This is a rough translation from the original Spanish text: "El mito desempeña, efectivamente, una primordial función politico-social, paradigmática, persuasiva y educadora a base de lenguaje que contiene representaciones colectivas communes, positivas o negativas, pero sempre compartidas por la comunidade y por ello de clara implicación político-social. Una comunidade político-social comparte los mitos al igual que comparte el lenguaje".

relevant to consider other sources from different periods and geographies, since they often reflect ancient knowledge, mores and how they survived and developed through time. This is clear when we consider, for example, Artemidorus. This source is much later than most of the ones that I explore in the following chapters, that can be dated to the archaic, classical and Hellenistic periods. I find it extremely important to discuss *Oneirocritica*, since it is the only work on dreams from antiquity that has survived until today, and we know that dream interpretation was already discussed centuries before Artemidorus' time. He himself makes a reference to Aristander of Telmessus (1.31), the supposed dream-interpreter of Philip and then Alexander the Great. In 1.64, Artemidorus mentions ancient interpreters of bath dreams, possibly relating them to Homeric times.[31] The relevance of the interpretation of dreams is already clear in the *Iliad* (1.62), when Achilles asks for a dream-interpreter (ὀνειρόπολος) to find out the reason why Apollo was punishing the Achaeans. Theophrastus (*Char.* 16.11), in the fourth century B.C.E., while naming the characteristics of the superstitious man, says that when such a man has a dream he immediately goes to the dream-interpreter (ὀνειροκρίτης), so to know to which divinity he needs to pray. In one of Theocritus' *Idylls* (21.33), two fishermen discuss a dream that one of them, named Asphalion, had. In this discussion, Asphalion asks his companion if he ever learned to interpret dreams (ἆρ' ἔμαθες κρίνειν ποκ' ἐνύπνια), to which the companion replies by arguing that his guess is as good as anyone's else, and that the best interpreter of dreams (ὀνειροκρίτης) is a man with common sense. Besides the relevance of dream reading in antiquity, Artemidorus' work is particularly special due to how he explores sexual contents without carrying any of the biases that other ancient authors might. Simultaneously, it is a window into the sexual lives of the people of his time, since his sources are the dreams dreamt by the people he found while travelling through Greece; and most likely a window into sexual practices of the past, that were conveyed by dream-

[31] See Harris-McCoy introduction (p.34) to his translation of the *Oneirocritica*. For the importance on dream-reading before the time of Artemidorus, see Winkler, 1990: 25.

interpreters that preceded him, whose texts did not survive. As Winkler (1990: 24) puts it, "Artemidorus' *Dream Analysis* continually puts of exhibit common social assumptions, shows the operation of androcentric and other sex-gender protocols, and yet itself stands outside them".

This wider approach is also particularly relevant when approaching myth. In the first chapter I explore the different versions of the myth of Actaeon, from the sixth century B.C.E. fragmentary evidence to the later retelling by Nonnos in the *Dionysiaca*. Although I focus more clearly on the value that this myth could have had to the men and women in 5^{th} – 3^{rd} century Greece, I nevertheless find it important to explore how Ovid and Nonnos approached it and the relevance of these later sources to our modern perception of the myth of Actaeon. Later Greek sources are also relevant to understanding how the perception of a specific activity developed in later stages, allowing me to discern the similarities and differences Therefore, despite most of the sources that I analyse in this thesis being traceable back to Classical-Hellenistic Athens, it is important that later sources such as Artemidorus and Nonnos be considered since they are windows both to their time and to past traditions.

To each transgression I provide an analysis that encompasses different scenarios, considering the specific social status of the people involved. In chapter 1, I explore a sexual visual transgression against the gods by analysing the myths of Actaeon, Tiresias and Pentheus. The latter does not fit the pattern that we see in the two previous examples, but nonetheless is a myth that conveys both a visual transgression, with possible sexual inspiration, and an offence against the gods. These myths would not only reinforce the appropriate code of conduct a human should have towards the gods, but also the social boundaries that one should respect when living in society. I then analyse the already mentioned episode of Gyges and Candaules, as an example of a sexual visual transgression directed to someone of higher social status. The two final sections deal with the code of conduct that people of similar social status should follow, specifically how to

look and when not to look at someone; and also, the rules of looking to prostitutes in the ancient world.

The second chapter follows the same sociological approach, analysing how the perception of sexual abuse of children would be understood when directed against prepubescent boys, girls and slaves. In the final two sections of chapter 2, I provide a legal and psychological perspective that differs from the rest of the thesis. The reason is that the sources on child sexual abuse provide us with information concerning possible legal protection of children; and one passage from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* seems to discuss the possible psychological consequences that an abused child might suffer in the future. Chapters 3 and 4 are shorter than the previous two, simply because there is less information available to consider. Nevertheless, the same methodology is applied, as well as the emphasis on a sociological reading of the sources, aiming to show how the perception of the transgression might vary according to the social status of the people involved. I start by providing examples of the socially sanctioned human behaviour towards animals and corpses, before moving to the analyses of specific examples of each sexual transgression, as provided in the surviving ancient sources. For chapter 3 there is considerable mythological material to be considered, since there are numerous myths where human sexual intercourse and animalistic aspects are connected. Most of these myths convey the liaisons of young girls and animal-shaped gods, which by definition is not human-animal sex. Therefore, in this chapter I chose to separate my approach to myth in two sections, one where I explore myths of sex between humans and animal-shaped gods, and a second where I explore the myth of Pasiphae, an actual case of human-animal sex. By exploring the similarities and differences between these two typologies of myths, I am able to show, in a clearer manner, what they actually convey of the ancient Greeks' perception of human-animal sex. In chapter 3, contrary to the other chapters, I also included an analysis of visual depictions of sex between humans and animals that is particularly relevant in connection with the previous mythological analyses.

The subject explored in chapter 4 – sex with corpses – did not have a strong presence in ancient myths, apart from one possible reference in the myth of Achilles and Penthesilea. Nevertheless, we find references to it in Herodotus, both the Egyptian episode already mentioned, as well as the narrative concerning Periander, the Corinthian tyrant, and his wife Melissa. The only other two references to sex with corpses are found in Parthenius of Nicaea's *Sufferings in Love* and Xenophon of Ephesus' second century C.E. novel, the *Story of Anthia and Habrocomes*, which I explore in detail at the end of the chapter.

CHAPTER 1

SEXUAL VISUAL TRANSGRESSION

1.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I address sexual transgression through the act of looking, which I already mentioned in the introduction with the reference to the episode of Gyges and Candaules. To fully understand the transgressive aspect of this action, I start by identifying the connection between eyes and sex in ancient Greek culture, and how the gaze carried a sexual charge. By stressing this relation, I am able to show what sort of visual contact was accepted in ancient Greek society, consequently separating it from the transgressive. I then move to analyses of specific examples of sexual visual transgression conveyed by ancient sources. I start by exploring the myths of Tiresias, Actaeon and Pentheus. As explained in the introduction, these three mythological accounts are not only examples of sexual visual transgression, but also of transgressing against the divine. I then analyse Herodotus' account of Gyges and Candaules which, like the former three myths, show the consequences of an act of sexual visual transgression when directed towards someone of higher social status. Consequently, to fully understand how this act was perceived, I need to analyse it within different social contexts, namely when it is directed towards people of the same and inferior social status. This way, I am able to explore the full scope of the sexualized gaze among Greek society, and map the social norms that regulated what could, and could not, be seen.

As I already mentioned, there are similarities between this sexual behaviour and our modern conception of voyeurism, motivating its use in classical scholarship. Segal (1982: 205) argues that, from a psychoanalytic point of view, Pentheus' "sexually

regressive voyeurism" is the reflection of his inability to accept his male sexuality. Fredrick (1995) approached the elements of voyeurism in the erotic paintings found in Roman houses, through the feminist theories that Laura Mulvey applied to cinema.[32] McMahon (1998: 48n74) states that the emperor Tiberius was a voyeur, according to Suetonius' testimony. This is actually one of the most accurate references to voyeurism that I have found in classical scholarship. Suetonius (*Tib*. 43) indeed states that Tiberius, while in Caprae, used to organize secret orgies where he watched the participants in triple-unions (*triplici serie conexi*) so he might get sexually aroused, something that was becoming increasingly difficult for the emperor (*deficientis libidines excitaret*). Skinner (2005: 86) argues that voyeurism is a "highly self-conscious motif" in vase painting, where female figures are sometimes accompanied by strange creatures "who ogle them". Lee (2009: 165) states that athletics and bathing in the nude provided several opportunities for the "voyeuristic gaze". Clarke (2014: 515) names the young man beholding two other men having intercourse, as depicted in the Warren cup, "voyeur". Younger (2011: 77-78) states that Roman parties implemented voyeurism, basing his argument on paintings that depict a couple engaging in intercourse with a third person present in the room, watching. Fonseca (2016) seeks to explore the *topos* of voyeurism in classical theatre and Greek-middle eastern myths.[33] Blanshard (2015: 101) argues that

[32] Mulvey's work has highly influenced theories of the gaze in the past thirty years. In her influential essay *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema*, originally published in 1975, Mulvey proposed two concepts of the gaze, where the pleasure of looking is marked by the ambivalence active/male and passive/female. One is fetishistic scopophilia, where the male spectator focuses on the beauty of specific body parts, splitting the woman into parts, iconizing the fragmentary body. By focusing on specific elements, the male viewer is not faced with the absence of the penis, and so the sexual difference between male/female is not recognized. By negating the lack of penis of the woman, the male spectator can retrieve pleasure, since he is never faced with the threat of castration that the lack of penis would induce. As Mulvey (1975: 13) puts it, the female on screen "connotes something that the look continually circles around but disavows: her lack of a penis, implying a threat of castration and hence unpleasure". The other avenue, as Mulvey names it, is a sadistic sort of voyeurism, that opposes the previous notion. Sadistic voyeurism requires the recognition of the sexual difference, that fetishistic scopophilia disavows. By recognizing such difference, the viewer treats it as a guilty offence (rooted in the fear of castration), and he seeks to exercise control over the female, subjugating her. In his paper, Fredrick does develop his conception of voyeurism, following and applying Mulvey's theories to the Roman frescos depicting Ariadne.

[33] Fonseca (2016: 258) indeed defines that, by voyeurism, she does not mean the paraphilia or any of the erotic contexts of the term, but instead a coordination between extreme curiosity and non-sexual voyeurism. "Importa […] salientar que o voyeurismo a que nos referimos, de carácter literário, mitológico e lendário, não cabe na categoria de parafilia, porque se sustenta num plano estético de fruição e não num plano físico-

group sex provides an environment filled with voyeuristic opportunities. Richlin (2015: 361) speaks of "ethnographic voyeurism".[34] Gardner (2015) classifies Lucian as a voyeur, because he was hiding under the cot when Meroe and Panthia planned their revenge on the sleeping Socrates.[35]

John Dillery (2004; 2008) argued that the ancient Greek term *theatēs* (θεατής) can, in specific situations, be accurately translated as 'voyeur'. Starting by analysing the description that Josephus (*CAp*. 1.232) makes of the pharaoh Amenophis' desire to see the gods (θεῶν γενέσθαι θεατήν), Dillery states that the inclusion of the verb 'to become' (γίγνομαι) emphasises the action described by the noun (θεατής), suggesting a different meaning, 'voyeur' instead of 'observer'. Providing other examples for his theory, Dillery approaches the description that Nonnos (5.305) makes of the encounter between Actaeon and Artemis where the same term is used (θηητὴρ δ᾽ ἀκόρητος ἀθηήτοιο θεαίνης). Dillery is correct when noting that Nonnos emphasises the uncontrollable, insatiable desire of Actaeon to see Artemis. By adding *akorētos*, Nonnos is enforcing the act of contemplating the divine, expressed by *theatēs* (in this case the author uses the Ionic form of the term, *thēētēr*), making it something else.[36] In his conclusion, Dillery (2004: 250-251) states that *theatēs* had a wide range of possible, specific meanings beyond spectator or contemplator and that voyeur is one of them, although he never specifically explains what he means by 'voyeur'. In fact, Dillery demonstrates that the use of *theatēs*, when accompanied by other

erótico, mas ultrapassa muitas vezes, o plano da mera *scopophilia* enquanto fruição estética. É antes uma coordenação de curiosidade extrema e voyeurismo não sexual.

[34] "Birt argues for the presence of very young children as toys in the houses of the mighty on the basis of several tendentious stories from historians writing, like Suetonius, long after the events recorded –Plutarch, Cassius Dio, Herodian. All might be said, like Plutarch, to be fond of anecdotes, in the case of Cassius Dio the more scurrilous the better; all wrote in Greek, and exhibit some degree of ethnographic voyeurism."

[35] In this paper, Gardner uses voyeurism several times; not only to define Lucian but also Pentheus (398), and even names the reader of the text a "voyeur-turned-participant" (399).

[36] The other examples that Dillery provides are from Greek novel. Achilles Tatius (5.1.4) used the same expression as Nonnos (θεατής ἀκόρητος), when referring to the reaction of Clitophon when he set his eyes on Alexandria. It is not an act of voyeurism *per se*, but the formulation of the phrase seeks to pass the same idea of incapacity to control the desire to contemplate something. In Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, there is a scene where Gnathon approaches Daphnis while he is attending his goats and, pretending to look at the animals, he secretly gazes the young man (δὲ ἵνα ἔνεμεν ὁ Δάφνις, λόγῳ μὲν τῶν αἰγῶν, τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς Δάφνιδος ἐγίνετο θεατής) (4.11.3). Here we have the same formulation that we find in the Josephus's example, where the term *theatēs* is enforced by *egineto*. It is a somewhat voyeuristic scenario, where a man tries to gaze, if not secretly at least without being noticed, upon his love interest.

terms that reinforce the insatiability and *akratic* character of the spectator, could indeed mean something close to voyeurism. However, there is a reason why Dillery focuses mostly on post-classical examples, and that is because he did not find many instances of this type of sentence formulation in earlier literature. For example, he approaches Nonnos' version of the myth of Actaeon but does not explore the earlier version by Callimachus. Dillery does, however, examine Pentheus in the *Bacchae*, and his supposed will to become a voyeur,[37] arguing that Pentheus expresses that.[38] Indeed, as Dillery noted, Pentheus is asked if he does want to become a *theatēs* of the maenads, but Pentheus' motivation is not only driven by sexual desires, making "voyeur" a rather unfit translation. Nevertheless, Pentheus is the ancient Greek figure most often qualified as a voyeur by twentieth-century scholarship,[39] and this story will be analysed later in this chapter.[40]

The term voyeur is constantly applied; however, the proper definition of what the scholar means when they use it is generally not provided. To apply it correctly, it first needs to be explained and understood in its several different meanings. The term, based on the Gallicism *voyeur*, was first coined to serve as a translation for the Freudian term *Schaulust*. This 'appropriation' of the French word is also noticeable among the English scientific community despite the term Peeping Tom, the voyeur of the 13th century legend of Lady Godiva. Tom is the popular example of a voyeur, a man that tries to gaze upon a naked woman without her consent.[41] Despite the massification of the application of the

[37] Podlecki (1974: 154) also translates *theatēs,* when referring to Pentheus, as "voyeur".
[38] Eur. *Ba*. 829. οὐκέτι θεατὴς μαινάδων πρόθυμος εἶ.
[39] We have already seen Dillery classifying him as such. Dodds (1960: xiiii) states that he has the curiosity of a Peeping Tom, and Barnard (1933) uses the same term to define him. Gregory (1985) starts her paper by asking if Pentheus is a voyeur. However, from all the definitions of Pentheus as a voyeur, the one that I find more interesting is Heath's (1992:23). Recognizing Gregory's arguments on the care that one should have when applying the term voyeurism, namely a declared erotic and sexual context required for a voyeuristic action, Heath placates the terminology issue by simply stating "I do not draw such fine distinctions in my use of the word between seeing "what is forbidden to be seen" and specifically sexually arousing viewing. Although he at least provides some explanation of his perception of voyeurism, nonetheless it seems like an easy exit to a necessary discussion.
[40] See section 3.3.
[41] John Draeger (2011) has an interesting approach to the legend of Lady Godiva, trying to promote an historical context to his interpretation of the legend.

term voyeurism, peeping or peeping Tomism were more common until the last decades of the 20th century.[42]

Today, the general and popular notion of voyeurism is basically the same as in Peeping Tom's time, however there is a lot more to the use of this term. As Rye and Meaney (2007: 47) stated, "voyeurism is pathological by some criteria and criminal by others", however, the definition and study of the concept is not completely addressed by the authors' affirmation considering that the term voyeurism is also amply used in social studies,[43] and cinematic and general artistic theory. Voyeurism has been listed in the *DSM* as a paraphilia since 1987, being a part of every issue until the fifth version, where it is succinctly defined as "spying on others in private activities" (*DSM-V*: 685), an action that makes the perpetrator feel an "intense sexual arousal from observing an unsuspecting person who is naked, in the process of disrobing, or engaging in sexual activity, as manifested by fantasies, urges, or behaviors". The definition is very clear and translates the most popular notion of voyeurism.[44]

Voyeurism is not only recognized as a mental disorder but also, as Rye and Meaney noted, is considered a crime according to the legal systems of various countries.[45] In the UK, under the 2003 *Sexual Offences Act* S67, an offence of voyeurism occurs when someone takes sexual gratification from secretly observing a person that is in a situation with reasonable expectation of privacy, and the crime can be perpetrated in a number of

[42] According to Metzl (2004: 129) voyeurism only appeared in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature* in 1979 and appeared only eight times in the *New York Times* from 1950 to 1980, which shows that it is quite a young term of the general population's lexicon.
[43] Such as Metzl's (2004) article on the growing popularity of reality TV.
[44] Indeed, several studies point to the fact that voyeurism is a very common practice in some societies: Langstrom (2010: 319) mentions two studies, one in Sweden where 2450 persons from both sexes and with an age gap between 18 to 60 years old, and a second smaller study comprising 60 U.S. college students from a rural part of the country. The Sweden statistics show that 191 of the 2450 persons interviewed reported at least one voyeuristic incident (8%; 12% of the men, and 4% of women). The U.S. statistics show that 42% had secretly watched others in sexual situations. In another study, university students where asked about the likelihood that they would secretly watch an attractive person undress, or two attractive persons engaging in sexual intercourse (Langstrom 2010: 320). The numbers state that 84% of men and as74% of women would engage in such a behaviour, although only 61% and 36% respectively maintained the same resolve if there was a level of risk of getting caught.
[45] This relation between psychiatric and legal approaches to paraphilias is observable about all the other sexual practices that I explore in this thesis.

ways: by direct observation on the part of the offender; by operating equipment with the intention of enabling someone else to observe the victim or by recording someone during a private act, or by installing equipment or constructing or adapting a structure with the intention of enabling the offender or another person to observe a private act, punishable with a prison sentence that can reach two years.[46]

This very succinct exploration of the significant range of voyeurism is enough to understand that it cannot be used lightly, without the proper definition. As we have seen, almost every definition of the term implies someone that transgressively looks at another person in a private situation and gains some sort of pleasure from the action. This certainly is not the meaning of the term in every instance of its usage in classical scholarship. If we take one of the listed examples, Lee (2009: 165) states that athletics and bathing in the nude provided an opportunity for the voyeuristic gaze. Certainly, Lee is not implying that in those scenarios some men might secretly gaze on others in a private situation, and feel some sort of sexual gratification, nor that a public bath may be classified as a private space. She is not implying that the action is punishable by law nor that public baths and athletics are an environment prone to the development of a mental disorders. What Lee means is that this scenario was an opportunity to discreetly peek on other naked bodies. I believe that this is the general meaning of voyeurism when applied in classical scholarship.[47] However, as I have already shown, there is much more to voyeurism than that, and indeed to prove it either as a mental disorder or a criminal offence, is quite difficult. *DSM*'s parameters establish that a diagnosis of voyeurism requires six months of observation, and UK law stipulates that an offence of voyeurism happens when the viewer takes sexual gratification from the action, which cannot be asserted unless the perpetrator is caught in *flagrante delicto*.

[46] In another Western European example, Portuguese law states that an action such as voyeurism incurs in a "crime de devassa da vida privada" (offence to the private life) that punishes the offender with a penalty that may reach a one-year prison sentence.
[47] Fredrick (1995) starts his paper by explaining the concept of voyeurism that he explores.

In this chapter, I argue that we have ancient examples of a sexual behaviour that shares some of the traits of voyeurism, specifically the physical act of gazing at the body of someone that was not meant to be gazed at. However, it is not voyeurism since these terms imply several different aspects – such as legal and psychiatric – that did not exist in ancient Greece. However, there was a notion of sexual visual transgression, an abnormal sexual behaviour that was perpetrated through the act of looking, a para-normal sexual behaviour or, as I argue in this study, a para-philia based on the act of looking, a sexual act that does not conform with the normal sexual dynamics of ancient Greek societies. Like all the other examples of transgressive sexual behaviour explored in this thesis, this sexual act does not lead to reproduction, is referenced by ancient authors as an abnormal, *anomos* behaviour, and its perception changed concerning the social status of the people involved. In the following section I start by exploring how the Greeks conceptualized the eyes and vision, exploring several different aspects of seeing in ancient Greece, and how the act of looking can carry different meanings in different situations, specifically how they can change according to the object of the gaze.

1.2. Vision and the power of looking: Love and desire through the eyes

The ancient Greeks already theorized the conception of looking. Democritus, in the 5th century, was one of the earliest to propose that every object emitted a *simulacrum*, a tiny copy of itself that entered the body through the eye, and through it to the soul.[48] There is a physical connection between the viewer and the view. Plato's theory also contemplates a certain physicality in looking, where the eyes touch upon the object and

[48] Diog. Laert. 9.44. For Democritus' theory of sight see English, 1915 and Stansbury-O'Donnell, 2014.

bring back an impression that invades the body through the eyes, expanding everywhere, including the soul (Plat. *Tim.* 45a-d). Both theories comprehend a sense of physicality in the connection between viewer and object, being the latter in part absorbed by the active looker.

In the case of love/desire, as Cairns (2011: 32) shows, there was an active force that emanates from the eyes of the lover, seeking to find the eyes of the loved one. In Greek literature, this action is sometimes described as rays or arrows shooting from one's eyes. In *Agamemnon* (742-743), Aeschylus relates love to a dart (μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος/ δηξίθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος). In the *Supplicants* (1003-1005) Danaus warns his daughters that the lover "shoots an arrow of enchantment from his eye, overcome by desire". In *Cratylus* (420b), when discussing the origin of words, Socrates derives the term *eros* from *eisreō*, considering that love/desire flows through the eyes. It describes love as something that comes in from outside, streaming into a person's body.

In Achilles Tatius' novel, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, probably written in the last quarter of the second century (Goldhill 2002: 376), the physicality of looking and the connection between desire and the eyes is evident. When describing the first time that he looked at Leucippe, Clitophon says "It is through the eye that love's wound passes [...]" (*Leuc. Clit.* 1.4.3). It is a recognition of an active/passive capacity of eye: it is through the eye that it is possible to reach the object of desire, but the same action makes the viewer a slave of desire. This sexual atmosphere hits its highest peak when the pleasure of mutual eye contact is described in the tone of actual sexual intercourse, where Achilles Tatius's describes a sort of copulation through the eyes, a quasi-physical connection embedded in the relation established by eye contact:

οὐκ οἶδας οἷόν ἐστιν ἐρωμένη βλεπομένη· μείζονα τῶν ἔργων ἔχει τὴν ἡδονήν. ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντανακλώμενοι ἀπομάττουσιν ὡς ἐν κατόπτρῳ τῶν σωμάτων τὰ εἴδωλα· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροή, δι᾽

αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρέουσα, ἔχει τινὰ μίξιν ἐν ἀποστάσει. καὶ ὀλίγον ἐστὶ τῆς τῶν σωμάτων μίξεως· καινὴ γάρ ἐστι σωμάτων συμπλοκή.

You do not know what it is to be able to see the one you love; it is a greater pleasure than further favours. When the eyes meet one another they receive the impression of the body as in a mirror, and this emanation of beauty, which penetrates down into the soul through the eyes, effects a kind of union however the bodies are sundered; 'tis something of a bodily union—a new kind of bodily embrace.[49]

The fact that for the Greeks eye-contact is the ultimate sexual stimulus is a matter of consensus among scholars. Halperin (1990a: 267) states that "The Greeks considered the eyes as the source of *ēros* and eye contact as the most powerful erotic stimulus". Skinner (2005: 85) not only seems to agree with this connexion of eyes and sexual desire, stating that "Sight is the mechanism by which desire is activated", but also stresses the link between the eyes and mutual love: "Eye contact denotes an emotional bond between two individuals". Cairns (2011: 37) states, similarly, that "for ancient Greeks the degree of intimacy is typically correlated with increased eye-contact". This connexion of eye contact and sexual intimacy is perceptible in the social decorum of ancient Greece. When a woman was seen by a man, she should blush and lower her gaze (Glazebrook, Mellor, 2013: 38-39), not allowing a greater level of intimacy, unless in a married couple. The importance of eye-contact in ancient Greek culture is well exemplified in the ritual of *anakalypteria*, the "decisive sacral action of the wedding" (Carson 1990: 163), the moment where the bride unveils herself for the first time, facing her newly-wed husband in front of the men of his family. It is the moment when the bride is touched for the first time by her husband, when they first look directly at each other's eyes and possibly exchange words (Foley 2001: 316),[50] the first intimate contact between the couple. The ritual signifies the bride's consent, an analogy to the surrender of her virginity (Levine

[49] Tr. Gaselee.
[50] Foley mentions the passage in *Alcestis* when, after the unveiling, Admetus speaks to Alcestis for the first time, although she does not reply (1144-46).

1995: 99; Carson 1990: 163), the moment where she ceases to be a *parthenos*. The first eye contact between husband and wife is a pre-enactment of the physical penetration that would happen later, a moment that would carry a considerable emotional and sexual charge that was expressed through mutual gazing. This ritualist "pre-devirgination" creates a singularity in the social accepted norms for exposure, considering that the physical scenario comprehends a *parthenos* being exposed to the gaze of the men belonging to the groom's household. It was uncommon for a girl to be in a situation where she would be largely exposed to external men. This becomes possible because of the penetration analogy created by the *anakalypteria*, ceasing the bride's maiden status and expanding the social boundaries of female exposure. In a 4th century B.C.E. *situla* attributed to the Parrish Painter, there is a representation of moment when Helen unveils herself to Paris.[51] He is naked, facing Helen who wears a transparent dress, while Aphrodite and Eros contemplate the scene. As Stansbury-O'Donnell (2014: 47) remarks "the connection between sight and desire is emphasized through their agency". This scene presents a scenario with immense erotic overtones but based mainly on the act of looking.

Love is an acting force that emanates from the eyes. A powerful active force that even when it touches an inanimate object, such as statue or an image, could provoke immense desire. In *Hippolytus* (1005-6), Hippolytus highlights the relevance that visual stimuli, not only actual sexual activity but also paintings, had in the society of his time, stressing that he has no desire in any of those routes to pleasure. No statue was more famous for its erotic apparatus than the Aphrodite of Knidos. The 4th century B.C.E. lost statue by Praxiteles is considered the first monumental female nude in Western art (Lee, 2015a: 103). The ancient reports that we possess mention the scandalous nudity of the statue, attracting both the male and female gaze. In a famous story told by Pliny the Elder (*HN* 36.21), a young man could not control his desire for the image of the goddess and

[51] Campanian red-figure *situla* (350-320 B.C.E.), attributed to the Parrish Painter. British Museum (1928,0719.3), London.

hid himself in the temple until he had the opportunity to embrace the statue. Unable to control his lust, the young man left a stain of semen on the image, however, the emotional charge of the situation was too much for him to bear and the young man killed himself in the end. As Stansbury-O'Donnell (2014: 44) argues for this case, looking without modesty and restraint can quickly escalate to transgression, and such transgression may result in punishment. The boy defiled the statue of Aphrodite, and the action eventually pushed him to his untimely death. In this particular example, like the myths of Tiresias, Actaeon and Pentheus that I explore in the following sections, the same act, looking, led to a series of actions that transgressed sexual and religious boundaries, eventually resulting in the death of the perpetrator.

Since archaic times, the image of Aphrodite was considered a strong sexual stimulus: [52]

> […] καί ῥ᾽ ὡς οὖν ἐνόησε θεᾶς περικαλλέα δειρὴν
> στήθεά θ᾽ ἱμερόεντα καὶ ὄμματα μαρμαίροντα,
>
> […] and when she marked the beauteous neck of the goddess,
> her lovely bosom, and her flashing eyes,

This passage from Homer's *Iliad*, describing the moment when Aphrodite tries to lure Helen to Paris's bed but is discovered by Helen, is a great example of the erotic power of visual stimulus in archaic Greek poetry.[53] Homer's description of Athena removing her *peplos* (*Il.* 5.733-737) also provides an opportunity for the poet's audience to see what was not supposed to be seen (as Tiresias learned) although there is a clear difference on

[52] *Il.* 3.396-398. Tr. A. T. Murray.
[53] For *eros* in Homer see Pereira, 2014. The sensuality of the goddess is described with such a profound level of detail that Monica Cyrino (2010: 54), notes "an almost voyeuristic interest in the specific characteristics of her awe-inspiring physicality". Not only her body inspires desire (ἱμερόεντα) as also her own eyes are flashing (μαρμαίροντα), passing the idea of fire-flashing vision. Cyrino's use of the term implies that an action of voyeurism occurs where Homer, and the audience that the *aoidos* addresses, are the spies, peeking at the goddess while she undresses.

how both episodes are told.[54] Aphrodite's episode is the confirmation of her beauty and sensuality, both perceivable by the act of looking. The eyes are the physical elements that allow someone to appreciate beauty and feel the desire fuelled by that same beauty.

In the *Odyssey* (18.190–96), Athena embellishes Penelope before her appearance before the suitors, by applying Aphrodite's immortal gifts (ἄμβροτα δῶρα) so she would inflame the men with desire.[55] The view of Aphrodite as a stimulus of sexual desire is also perceptible in the episode of the discovery of the goddess' infidelity by Hephaestus (*Od.* 8.341-2), when Hermes expresses the desire to be in Ares' place, even if lying with Aphrodite would mean being imprisoned by Hephaestus's net. Hesiod (*Op*. 65-66) also connects the notion of visual erotic stimulus and Aphrodite when he tells how Zeus ordered the goddess to enhance the sensuality of Pandora so she would promote "longing and cares that weary the limbs" (πόθον ἀργαλέον καὶ γυιοβόρους μελεδώνας) of men. The visual representations of Aphrodite were not the only ones that could provoke desire, nor the only images to convey a sense of sexuality. Eye contact in Attic vase paintings demonstrates a closer, more powerful emotional bound between two figures. In a red-figure cup by the Briseis painter, an *erastēs* holds the *erōmenos* in his arms.[56] The two figures, perpetually waiting for the touch of each other lips, are depicted looking deeply into each other's eyes. Vision once again promotes a powerful sexual stimulus.

Most, if not all, depictions of sexual activity in ancient vases belonged to the symposium space. These images are meant to be viewed by specific persons – generally men and women who would be sexually available - in a specific environment where sexual activity, fuelled by wine, would not be unusual, a room that would be frequented mostly by men and prostitutes, flute-girls and dancers. The prostitutes are constantly

[54] On this see Magalhães, 2016: 34-37.
[55] On this see Cyrino, 2010: 55. Athena's capacity to embellish mortals, understanding what would be appealing to the eyes of the opposite sex, is also used to help Odysseus when he is discovered by Nausicaä. The goddess makes the hero taller, curls his hair and sheds grace, *charis*, upon his head (*Od*. 6.223-237).
[56] Attic red-figure cup from Vulci (c. 480 B.C.E.), Louvre (G278). For a detailed analysis of mutual gazing in vase paintings, see Frontisi-Ducroux, 1996.

represented in these vases, sometimes depicted unclothed and exposed to the men's gaze or in explicit sex scenes (Corner, 2014: 201). We should consider the impact that the contemplation of those paintings would have on those men. Clarke (2014: 510), argues that the symposium images, where men are constantly debasing women, suggest that the elite male viewed them as transgressive and possibly humorous, "a kind of sexual carnival that overturned the usual rules of sexual behaviour encoded in Athenian law and literature". For a man, the scenario of the symposium could indeed propitiate the opportunity to engage in sexual adventures that would not fit the husband-wife relationship. It would be an opportunity to fulfil sexual fantasies, and some of those might be depicted on those vases, painted by men, depicting sexual scenarios that could be a source of visual sexual stimulus for other men. It is at least possible to assume that vase paintings in the symposium could function as an inspirational source for the people in the room, motivating ideas and envisaging sexual scenes that could indeed be real if they so desired. In sexual scenarios, such as the orgy scene painted by the Brygos painter,[57] there is the representation of a certain level of excess, of sexual force and violence that would not be admissible in the context of the conjugal bedroom. Group sex is a scenario filled with semi-peeping toms, where some aroused men do not partake in the active sexual scene, maintaining a secondary position that is mainly the one of the spectator. In this vase, the figure on the right holds a lamp under the buttocks of a prostitute who is being penetrated while being held in the air by another man. There is a certain level of violence here, since the proximity between the lamp and the female body would certainly result in pain; however, as Frontisi-Ducroux (1996: 90) noticed, the lamp helps the outsider (that Frontisi-Ducroux names "voyeur"[58]) to witness the entire scene. He is present during the

[57] Athenian red-figure kylix (500-450), attributed to the Brygos painter. Museo archeologico nazionale (3921), Florence. Beazley *ARV* 372.31, 398. See also Kilmer, 2002.
[58] Strictly speaking, this man cannot be considered a voyeur because his observation of the orgy is not secret.

intercourse, without participating in it, and he does not appear to be sexually enjoying the action, at least no element points to it.

As in the modern art usage of voyeurism such as Hitchcock[59] and Yoshiyuki[60], ancient vase painters understood the sexual attraction of visual stimuli. As Skinner (2005: 86) puts it:

> In vase painting, voyeurism is a highly self-conscious motif. Female figures are accompanied by weird creatures who ogle them: a detached phallus equipped with an eye, or a surreal beast such as a phallus-bird or phallus horse. These beings may be surrogates for the external viewer, expressing the link between the voyeuristic and the sexual impulses and the masculine privilege of gazing at women sexually.

Sex and looking walked hand to hand in ancient Greece. As we have seen, Greek culture rationalizes the eyes and the conception of looking to someone as a powerful sexual stimulus. This is recognizable in the social and physical barriers that existed between men and women. The recognition of the erotic charge of the eye motivated a socio-cultural response to avoid it, and that is what I explore in the following sections.

[59] Voyeurism is a motif that Hitchcock constantly explores. In his 1960's *Psycho*, Hitchcock not only makes the audience watch the perpetration of a voyeuristic incursion, in the famous scene where Norman Bates (Anthony Perkins) gazes, through a hole in the wall, over Marion Crane (Janet Leigh) while she is disrobing herself but also puts the audience in the shoes of the perverted Norman Bates since the camera focuses on the image on the other side of the peep hole, which is completely perceptive as the image narrows in order to give the circular format of the hole. In *Rear Window*, L. B. Jefferies's (James Stewart) nurse Stella (Thelma Ritter) states "we've become a race of Peeping Toms". When discussing the constant exploration of this motif, Hitchcock said: "I'll bet you that nine out of ten people, if they see a woman across the courtyard undressing for bed, or even a man puttering around in his room, will stay and look; no one turns away and says, "It's none of my business." They could pull down their blinds, but they never do; they stand there and look out."

[60] In his work entitled *The Park*, Yoshiyuki photographed not only several sexual encounters that occurred in a Japanese park in the 70s but also the voyeurs that peeped on the same scene. Here the audience is placed in various positions: they are the voyeur peeping a couple having sex as well as a voyeur of a voyeur, peeping at him pleasuring himself.

1.3. Looking at gods

1.3.1. Tiresias

In Callimachus' *The Bath of Pallas*, it is narrated[61] how the goddess Athena and her female companions were surprised by a young Tiresias who, driven by thirst, went to the spring known as the spring of the Horse, on mount Helicon, where the goddess bathed. Although unwittingly, Tiresias laid his eyes on the naked body of Athena, seeing that "which is not lawful to be seen" (οὐκ ἐθέλων δ' εἶδε τὰ μὴ θεμιτά).[62] Notwithstanding the innocence and accidental aspect of the situation, Athena immediately punishes the transgression, blinding Tiresias. The reason why it was necessary to punish Tiresias for this visual crime was supposedly set by Zeus, whose law (νόμος) dictates that anyone who beholds any of the immortals, against that god's will, should pay a heavy price. (ὅς κε τιν' ἀθανάτων, ὅκα μὴ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἕληται, ἀθρήσῃ, μισθῶ τοῦτον ἰδεῖν μεγάλω).

This is, however, just one of the versions of the blinding of Tiresias. When describing the myth of Tiresias, Apollodorus (3.6.7) lists two versions: the bath of Athena that according to the author of the *Bibliotheca* was already told by Pherecydes, centuries before Callimachus; and another version where Tiresias was transformed into a woman because he separated two snakes that were copulating on mount Cyllene, already told by Hesiod.[63] When contemplating the same snakes copulating again, Tiresias was reversed into his original gender. Being the only person that understood what it meant to be both a man and a woman, he was the perfect judge to decide over a dispute that Zeus and Hera

[61] For an approach to the role and gender ambiguity of the narrator in Callimachus' hymns, see Morrison, 2005.

[62] Heath (1992: 29) interestingly points that, although the narrator is stating that Athena's naked body is that which is not lawful to be seen, his mother, Chariclo, would also be naked, bathing with the goddess. There is a curious parallel here with Pentheus in the *Bacchae* that is very much aware that he will see his mother in a sexual scenario.

[63] Interestingly, as Michalopoulos (2012: 233) noted, when narrating this myth, Ovid (*Met.* 3.325) applies the term *ictus* (*corpora serpentum baculi violaverat ictu*) that was a common euphemism for "male sexual act", which points to the fact that, in this version, Tiresias was punished for a sexual transgression. Buxton (1980: 34) mentions a version (Tzetzes *schol. in Lyk. Alex.* 683) where Tiresias was transformed into a woman because he saw Athena naked, which seems to be a late mixing of the two archaic traditions.

had, concerning which gender enjoyed sex more. Tiresias answered that females enjoyed it nine parts to one, and for revealing such secret he was blinded by Hera.

Normally, gods do not show themselves in their true form to mortals. Usually they choose to appear in disguise, like Athena to Arachne and Demeter to the king of Eleusis. In his various affairs, Zeus is accustomed to assume forms other than his own, such as a golden rain in the myth of Perseus or a bull in the abduction of Europa.[64] Even when he shows himself in anthropomorphic semblance - he chooses to appear as Artemis, when he appears to Calisto, or as the mortal Amphitryon, when he seduces Alcmene – it is never as himself. In representations of the birth of Dionysus, Zeus is forced to show himself in his true form to Semele, resulting in the death of the mortal woman. This myth shows that this divine objection to being seen by mortals is not only based on a personal wish but is also a way to protect them.

In the case of Tiresias and Athena, the goddess did not have the choice to disguise herself, being seen without her permission, and the transgression is aggravated because Athena is seen naked.[65] Already in the *Iliad* we find a female figure expressing her preoccupation on being seen in a sexual context. When Zeus tries to seduce Hera, on the top of mount Ida, she argues that they would be exposed to the gaze of the other gods, conveying the shame that she would feel when facing the viewers.[66] She proposes instead to return to the safety of the bedroom, where they could enjoy the pleasure of sex in privacy, protecting themselves from the eyes of others. Hera's conception of sex involves secrecy, is levelled by a sense of shame in the exposure of what should be private.[67]

[64] Animal-shaped gods are approached in section 3.2.2.
[65] As Bulloch (1985: 21) noted, the real offence that needs to be punished is the revelation of sexual secrets.
[66] Cairns (1993: 203) briefly explores this episode.
[67] The author of the *Dissoi Logoi* (2.4) shows the same sense of privacy. It states that it is honourable for a married couple to have sex in the privacy of their room, but it is shameful (*aischros*) to have it in a more public space where they can be seen. The exposure of the female body goes against the natural thinking of the Greeks, transgresses their social-cultural values and, when indeed it happens, tradition tells us that they should be punished.

The myth of Athena and Tiresias conforms to the same sense of shame, where the sexual (and in this case religious) secret should be protected from the outsider's gaze, however the potential transgression is aggravated by the object of the gaze: Athena. The body of the divine *parthenos* constitutes territory that was never explored, skin that was never seen or touched, and because of that it is a great aphrodisiacal element.[68] When Aphrodite, the goddess of erotic love and seduction, intends to seduce Anchises, she takes the form of a maiden (παρθένω ἀδμήτῃ),[69] being the form most likely to arouse a man. It is not by chance that the most striking myths of sexual visual transgression entail two virgin goddesses, Athena and Artemis,[70] the two bodies that should not be seen, especially by men.

The scenario, the spring in the mountain, much like the meadow,[71] is a place of sexual allure and adds sexual overtones to the myth of Tiresias and Athena. Bathing was thought to increase sexual attractiveness and improve fertility (Lee 2015: 115), being part of the cleansing ritual after intercourse. In the Hesiodic account, Aphrodite is born from the sea (*Th.* 192-195), rising from the water. In the *Homeric hymn to Aphrodite* (5.54), the goddess saw Anchises for the first time "among the many springs of Ida's peaks", and, before seducing Anchises, Aphrodite bathes and perfumes herself.[72] By bathing, much like Aphrodite, Athena is seen through a different angle, a sexual perspective.

---

[68] As Llewellyn-Jones (2001: 257) puts it, "the body of the virgin is inherently sexy".
[69] *Hymn* 5.81-83. See Cyrino, 2010: 90.
[70] When addressing the myths of the two virgins, Loraux argued that the accounts have one central difference: the fact that Artemis is conceived as a sexual being and Athena not. As Loraux (1995: 215) said, when Tiresias saw the goddess bathing he looked at "a forbidden body (and perhaps *the* forbidden body)". I disagree with this thesis of the asexuality of Athena, as I have already stated in another article (Magalhães, 2016). Although the virginity of Athena is an important trait of her character, there are different episodes where her sexuality and femininity are evident. The most famous is the attempt of rape by Hephaistos, where Athena clearly is an object of sexual desire (Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.14.3). Her reaction in Apollodorus account also adds to her feminine characterization, since instead of fighting and easily overpowering the lamest of the gods, she reacts exactly like any mortal woman would: she runs. Erichthonius is born from that encounter, although Athena is never penetrated. She maintains her virginal status, however at the same time is able to play the role of the mother, aiding Erichthonius during his life. In a fragment by Euripides, Athena does retaliate and hits Hephaestus on the head with her spear. For this version, and a view on Athena as a sexually charged figure, see Deacy, 2002 and Magalhães, 2016.
[71] For a discussion on the meadow and its sexual allure see Deacy, 2013.
[72] In the *Odyssey* (8.362-66), Aphrodite's beauty is also enhanced with a bath, contrary to Penelope who, not wanting to look more attractive, refuses the suggestion to bathe.

This prohibition for men to behold the naked body of Athena was deeply asserted in ritual. Similar to the ritual in Argos,[73] during the *Plynteria*, one of the Athenian festivals dedicated to their patron goddess, the image of Athena *Polias* was washed by young women, *loutrides*, in a ritual where no man was allowed. The image was disrobed, and both the statue and its clothes were washed and purified. The goddess was kept from the gaze of men until it was once again covered[74], when it would be safe from masculine eyes. This emphasis on the protection of the divine body is also perceptible in the myth of Actaeon, as I explore in the following section.

1.3.2. Actaeon

In direct correlation with the bath of Athena, the myth of Actaeon, as described by Callimachus, became the most popular account of the demise of the hero, widely attested in later Roman literature and art. The tale is told in the following lines of the poem, after the blinding of Tiresias. When Chariclo, one of the dearest companions of Athena and mother of Tiresias, saw the curse that fell on her son, she begged Athena to undo the punishment and restore Tiresias' eyesight. Despite showing some sympathy for the pain that her companion was feeling, Athena refuses Chariclo's request, arguing that Actaeon, who committed a similar crime, suffered an even harsher punishment than Tiresias. In the *Hymn*, Actaeon unwillingly (just like Tiresias) saw Artemis bathing. Enraged, the goddess made Actaeon's dogs chase their owner and devour him.[75]

This myth, whose oldest surviving literary account is the one by Callimachus (although the poet himself states that he is only conveying ancient knowledge), is later echoed in Pausanias (9.2.3-4).

[73] Depew (2004: 128) argues that the hymn represents an Argive Plynteria in progress, where the goddess' statue is about to be ritually washed.
[74] Llewellyn-Jones,2001: 245; Magalhães, 2016: 35
[75] I explored the several versions of the myth of Actaeon, both in literature and in art, in Magalhães, 2018 (forthcoming). The paper was amply based on this section of my thesis.

καλοῦσι δὲ τὴν μὲν Ἀκταίωνος κοίτην, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ καθεύδειν φάμενοι τῇ πέτρᾳ τὸν Ἀκταίωνα ὁπότε κάμοι θηρεύων, ἐς δὲ τὴν πηγὴν ἐνιδεῖν λέγουσιν αὐτὸν λουμένης Ἀρτέμιδος ἐν τῇ πηγῇ. Στησίχορος δὲ ὁ Ἰμεραῖος ἔγραψεν ἐλάφου περιβαλεῖν δέρμα Ἀκταίωνι τὴν θεόν, παρασκευάζουσάν οἱ τὸν ἐκ τῶν κυνῶν θάνατον, ἵνα δὴ μὴ γυναῖκα Σεμέλην λάβοι. ἐγὼ δὲ ἄνευ θεοῦ πείθομαι νόσον λύσσαν τοῦ Ἀκταίωνος ἐπιλαβεῖν τοὺς κύνας: μανέντες δὲ καὶ οὐ διαγινώσκοντες διαφορήσειν ἔμελλον πάντα τινὰ ὅτῳ περιτύχοιεν.

It is called the bed of Actaeon, for it is said that he slept thereon when weary with hunting, and that into this spring he looked while Artemis was bathing in it. Stesichorus of Himera says that the goddess cast a deer-skin round Actaeon to make sure that his hounds would kill him, so as to prevent his taking Semele to wife. My own view is that without divine interference the hounds of Actaeon were smitten with madness, and so they were sure to tear to pieces without distinction everybody they chanced to meet.[76]

Besides the bath version, which seems to be the standard version for Actaeon's demise in the 2nd century C.E., Pausanias alludes to a different myth where Actaeon's punishment was due to his sexual interest in Semele. The author refers this version back to Stesichorus of Himera[77] (6th-5th B.C.E.), which hints at the antiquity of the myth. We have a reference to the same myth in Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 3.4.4), where he tells a version that was attributed to Acusilaus (6th B.C.) in which Zeus wanted Actaeon to be punished because of his sexual interest in Semele. The oldest surviving version of this version of myth is a fragment of a papyrus dictionary of metamorphoses:

> ʾΑκταίων ὁ ʾΑρισταῖ[ο]ν καί Αὐ[τονόης, τῶν Σεμέ-]
> λης ἐφιέμενος γάμων αυτ [ca. 14]
> το πρός τοῦ μητροπάτοπο[ς ca.6 μετεμορ-]
> φώθη εἰ[ς] ἐλάφου δόκησιν διά βο[υλήν] ʾΑρτέμ[ι-]
> δος καί διεσπαράσθη ὑπό τῶν ἑ[α]υτ[οῦ] κυνῶν, ὥ[ς]
> φησιν Ἡσίοδος ἐν Γυναικόω Καταλόγωι
>
> Actaeon, the son of Aristaeus and Autonoe, desiring marriage with Semele, … his mother's father … [he] was transformed to the appearance of a stag through the design of Artemis and was torn apart by his own dogs, as Hesiod says in the *Catalogue of Women*.[78]

[76] Tr. W.H.S. Jones.
[77] Stesichorus fr. 236.
[78] Tr. Renner.

The fragment once again attests the antiquity of the myth, by referring to the lost Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. From the sources that survive until today we can deduce that the Actaeon-Semele motif was famous during the sixth and fifth centuries,[79] however, the references made by Apollodorus and Pausanias clearly indicate that, in their time, that version is the exception to the more common bath myth.

The only complete literary reference to Actaeon from the 5th century is in the *Bacchae*, when Euripides (*Ba.* 337-40) states that Actaeon was punished because he claimed to be a better hunter than Artemis.[80] Euripides' reference to Actaeon in the context of Pentheus' fate is far from an innocent remark. They suffered remarkably similar deaths, both violently destroyed, the former by his dogs and the latter at the hands of the Theban maenads.[81] Heath (1992: 10) argues that Euripides either borrowed this from some unknown tradition or indeed invented a new motive for Actaeon's demise to establish a more suitable parallel with Pentheus' transgression. In the *Bacchae*, Actaeon offends Artemis directly[82], like Pentheus offends Dionysus.

Diodorus Siculus (4.81.4) gives a different account, according to which Actaeon is shown to have sexual intentions towards Artemis. As Schlam (1984: 87) notices, it is the transposition of the archaic motif for the punishment of the hero, the pursuit of Semele, to Artemis. In Diodorus, it is Artemis, the virgin goddess, who is the subject of Actaeon's sexual desire, and for craving what should not be craved, and the mortal is sentenced to death.[83]

Here we have two main myths, that possibly coexisted, with the overwhelming presence of two mythological figures - Actaeon and Artemis - leading to the same

[79] It is considered by some scholars (Renner 1978: 283; Schlam 1984: 86-87; Deacy, McHardy 2013: 1003). However, I believe that the bath myth is older than Callimachus' account.
[80] Schlam (1984: 85) argues that this version of the myth was not original in Euripides, but that it might also be the reason for Actaeon's death in the *Toxotides*, the lost tragedy of Aeschylus.
[81] As Schlam (1984: 87) notices, Euripides makes several references to Actaeon in the *Bacchae*, reinforcing the similarity of both characters that would even die in a similar way, by *sparagmós.*
[82] Heath says that this is the first time that Actaeon directly offends Artemis, however he is not considering here that the bath version might be as old as the accounts by Pherecydes.
[83] Heath (1992: 3) states that, in Diodorus, Actaeon was punished for his "attempt to violate Artemis in her own temple".

inescapable fate – the destruction of Actaeon - for a crime that, although different, seems to share a common matrix of sexual transgression.[84] The bath myth in Callimachus conforms to the same construction of the myth of Athena and Tiresias: the same typology of space – the spring –, the same characters – a mortal man and a virgin goddess –, and the same sexual visual transgression. The outermost difference between the two myths is the punishment. While Tiresias was blinded - the loss of sight as punishment for a visual transgression, an affliction relieved at the end when Athena granted him the gifts of the soothsayer - Actaeon was violently destroyed. Despite the differences in the punishments' severity, especially considering that it is the same action, both punishments are central to every version of the myth of each character – Tiresias is blinded in all the versions of his myth, and Actaeon is always killed.

Regarding the Actaeon – Semele version, we should consider the reasons why the hunter met his demise. Why was Actaeon punished?[85] The few references that we have tend to show that the reason for this was because Actaeon wooed Semele, however that *per se* does not explain the reason for the punishment, unless wooing Semele was forbidden. If we consider this option, we must also consider the reasons why it was prohibited. Lacy (1990: 28-29) argues that the possible reason for this was the intromission that a relationship between Actaeon and Semele would mean in the Dionysian cycle. He quickly dismisses the possibility of a punishment due to incest, since

[84] On the similarity of the myths, Depew (1994: 411) argues that the "Athena/Tiresias account is a doublet for a similar story, lost to us but available to Callimachus, which featured Artemis and Actaeon." She continues her argument concerning the pre-existence of the myth by affirming that "Athena's bath scene may seem out of character. Callimachus, however, did not make it up. It is extant before him in Pherecydes, whose account Callimachus' matches except for one point: Athena's extended consolation and her reference in it to Actaeon's punishment". I agree with Depew's point of view on the antiquity of the bath myth. The narrator of the hymn states that the version is not his own (μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων), and there is no reason why this confession of the poet should not be taken at face-value. Buxton (1980: 31n62) also indicates that the myth was very popular in antiquity. As Lacy points (1990: 33), Apollodorus' mention of the version of Acusilaus as a minority view could imply that the most famous bath version was also part of the literary world of the time. Also, the punishment through the dogs fits the bath myth, since Actaeon was hunting and so it was normal to be accompanied by his dogs but does not make the same sense in the Semele version. Why were the dogs nearby during a scene of courting? Lacy (1990: 33) argues that the bath myth may be at least as old as the Semele version and I do not see any reason to disagree.

[85] This expression was included in the title of the paper that I presented at the conference in honour of Sir John Boardman: There and back again: Greek art in motion (May 2017, Lisbon), and has since been accepted for publication by *Archaeopress: Publishers of Academic Archaeology*.

Semele is Actaeon's aunt, however, such consideration is not accepted by several scholars. Depew (1994: 412n15) states that Lacy is wrong in this assumption, arguing that, although the element of incest in this myth does not follow the "norm in archaic Greece, such intra-familial marriages are attested".[86] Janko (1984: 301) also considers the element of incest to be present in this version of the myth, and so the excessive punishment is suited to the crime.[87]

I believe that the sexual intentions of Zeus towards Semele and the rivalry that Actaeon's own interests would represent would be enough for the punishment of the hunter. As Janko (1984: 301) puts it, "Semele belongs to Zeus, not, it is implied, to Actaeon". A fragment of *Semele*, a tragedy by Euripides, shows Actaeon being killed by Zeus, because he was a competitor for Semele. In Acusilaus' account, Artemis punished Actaeon so he would not take Semele as his wife.[88] Moreover, the accusation of Semele's sisters in the *Bacchae*, namely that she was accused of engaging in an illicit sexual relationship (Eur. *Ba.* 26-31) may be a remembrance of this ancient tradition.[89]

---

[86] However, Depew does not provide any sources where an aunt-nephew union is considered incest.

[87] Nevertheless, blinding appears to have been a fit punishment for incest, or sexual transgressions in general. Oedipus, the paradigmatic case of incest in antiquity, chooses to blind himself after discovering his crime. Buxton (1980: 32) lists incest, adultery, rape and seduction as crimes usually punished with the blinding of the perpetrator. In Locri Epizephirii, the *moichos* was blinded (Cantarella, 2005: 244). Nonetheless, I also see a possibility, contrary to Lacy's opinion, where the incest element may carry some weight, since at least it is a better explanation for the extreme violence that Actaeon is made to suffer. However, if we compare Actaeon's possible incestuous intentions with Oedipus' myth, one question arises: Why is Actaeon punished before committing the crime, while Oedipus is punished after consummating marriage with his mother? Schlam (1984: 82-83) states that in pre-Callimachus sources, the hunter suffers because of an act of hubris, marked by the intentionality of the perpetrator, contrasting to the bath episode where Actaeon stumbles on the scene innocently. In a way, it also contrasts with Oedipus' myth, in which the hero's intention is to avoid becoming involved in an incestuous relationship.

[88] Deacy, McHardy 2013: 1003 explores these references.

[89] In several accounts of the romance between Zeus and Semele, it is shown the great affection that Zeus had for the mortal. Hesiod (*Th*. 940) tells of how Semele and Zeus were united in love; Pentheus (*Ba*. 245) says that Semele was punished because she claimed a marriage with Zeus (γάμους). In Ovid's account (*Met.* 3.273-315) the god does not abandon Semele, but instead accompanies her during the pregnancy. When she, instigated by Juno, asks Jupiter to show his true form, he desperately attempts to avoid the request, trying to protect both his love interest and their unborn child. The only reason why he is compelled to perform the fatal deed is his promise to Semele, that he would give her anything she wanted, another token of the affection that he devoted to her. However, there are other accounts that contradict this love story. Pausanias (3.24.3) tells a specific version from the inhabitants of Brasiae, where Semele and the baby Dionysus were found by Cadmus, put in a chest that washed up on the coast, where they were found by the villagers but Semele was already dead. Semele, after giving birth to her son by Zeus, was discovered by Cadmus and put with Dionysus into a chest, which was washed up by the waves in their country. Semele, who was no longer alive when found, received a splendid funeral, but they brought up Dionysus. Deacy, McHardy 2013: 1003 discuss a possibility where Semele was deliberately killed by Zeus, as punishment for engaging in a relationship with Actaeon.

Actaeon's transgression is almost always related to some sort of sexual transgression,[90] either by seeing the naked body of Artemis, desiring Artemis, desiring Semele or possibly forcing himself on her. Although the few lines of text that we possess do not emphasize this possibility, it is not abnormal to have a description of mythological scenes of rape where no vocabulary especially connected with violence is used. As Karakantza (2003: 15) puts it "[…] in Greek mythic accounts, marriage, seduction and rape are barely distinguishable, and metaphorically the acculturated form of marriage is consummated through the pursuit, capture and taming of a young girl […]".[91] As already mentioned, the topic of sexual intentions in the myth of Actaeon is also found in the later version of Diodorus, where the hunter expresses his desire to consummate marriage with Artemis. This version, where the intentionality of the action is clear, may possibly be a redirection of an ancient motif towards a new target, considering that Actaeon suffers the same fate in both versions. Although the accounts by Callimachus and Ovid emphasize the unwillingness of Actaeon to see the goddess, we know that, in every other version of the myth, the hunter was guilty of an intentional transgression. That intentionality is observable in both Euripides and Diodorus, and in the later accounts by Apuleius and Nonnos. In fact, Callimachus' version is the first written evidence of the innocence of Actaeon. In the oldest surviving sources, he is always the culprit of an intentional act of hubris.[92]

Even if we consider the substantial number of ancient artistic representations of Actaeon, no definite answer is obtained because, although several representations of Actaeon's punishment did survive,[93] there is no depiction of his crime. When considering

[90] Except for his role in the *Bacchae*.
[91] Sourvinou-Inwood (1991: 65-79), also explores these thin lines between scenes of pursuit, seduction and rape.
[92] On this point, Heath (1992: 33) alludes to the possibility of the intentionality of Callimachus in portraying the innocence of Actaeon so he had a more accurate parallel with Tiresias.
[93] According to Schlam (1984: 87-94) we possess about six black-figure vases and eleven red-figure Attic vases with depictions of the death of Actaeon, and in none of those do we have a representation of the transgression, although in several of them we have Artemis present in the scene. Two of the most interesting examples are the fragment of a volute krater by the Pan Painter and an Apulian amphora in Berlin (Lacy, 1990: 41), where the death of Actaeon is witnessed by Aphrodite and Eros. In the first, Actaeon entices

the bath myth, the lack of ancient representations of the crime should not be a surprise considering the consequences that resulted from gazing on the naked body of Artemis. The lack of representations of both Athena and Artemis disrobed does hint at the cautionary meaning that these myths add in ancient Greece. The only known Greek representation that disrobes Artemis is a gem from the first century B.C.E.,[94] also showing Actaeon gazing the goddess's naked body, hiding behind a tree. This is, however, a representation very much embedded in the Hellenistic post-Callimachus tradition that we also encounter in Roman art, where representations of the bath of Artemis are not uncommon.[95]

In later sources, the intentionality of Actaeon's peeping becomes evident. In Apuleius (2.4), Actaeon is no longer the unwilling victim as in the versions of Callimachus and Ovid, but he is driven by his own curiosity (*curioso*) and specifically waits to watch the naked goddess bathing her divine body (*in fonte loturam Dianam opperiens visitor*). In Nonnos, who provides the longest description of Actaeon's myth, the transgression is certainly intentional.[96] The author narrates the desire that Actaeon felt to gaze at the body that was forbidden (Non. *D.* 5.305. θηητήρ δ'ἀκόρητος ἀθηήτοιο θεαίνης) and how he saw every inch of the naked goddess (ἀγνόν ἀνυμφεύτοιο δέμας διεμέτρεε κούρης). Actaeon was discovered by a nymph that observed him while he "stared with stolen glances on the unclothed shape of her queen" (καί τόν μέν ἀνείμονος εἶδος ἀνάσσης ὄμματι λαθριδίῳ δεδοκημένον ὄμματι λοξῷ). In Nonnos we have a final take on a myth that was known for, at least, one thousand years.

Artemis by making a gesture with his left hand, that Schlam reads as a possible erotic element. In the latter, the death of Actaeon is linked with sexual desire by the presence of Eros and Aphrodite.

[94] Blue chalcedony gem. 1st century B.C.E. Antikensammlung,Staatliche Museen zu Berlin (FG6435). (*LIMC* Aktaion 115a).

[95] On the position of myth in imperial Rome see Graf (2002). "In late Republican and early Augustan Rome, myths (*fabulae*) were universally understood as poetic fictions; this goes back to the late sixth century".

[96] Throughout the *Dionysiaca* Nonnos describes several scenarios where one character spies on another in a private situation, among which the myth of Actaeon and Artemis is the most detailed. Newbold (2008: 71) counts twenty-six of these scenes and Schlam (1984: 108) counts twenty-three.

In Callimachus' *Hymn*, the two bath myths are intimately connected.[97] As was stated before, there is a connection between the bath of Pallas and a similar ritual that took place in Argos. The poem opens with the unnamed narrator summoning the women from Argos to perform the ritual of the washing of the image of Athena. Only the women are summoned, since the ritual entails that no man should lay his eyes on the disrobed image of the goddess. As Stephens (2011: 4) points out, "the central section of the poem contains a cautionary tale directed at the Argive men, who are urged to avert their eyes from the sacred event". Any man who knew the myth would know the consequences of gazing, not only the naked body of Athena during this ritual, but also any nude divine body, unless that was the deity's will. In Callimachus, the transgressional behaviour surpasses the ritual, since Actaeon committed the same offence as Tiresias but the episode with Artemis is not symbiotic to a ritual in her honour. Both episodes go beyond the mythological narrative, carrying a social meaning, stipulating rules for contact with the divine. It is a serious religious transgression. By gazing upon a divine body, without the goddesses' consent, Tiresias and Actaeon fail to respect the predominance of gods over mortals and consequently are harshly punished.

However, there is more in Callimachus' *Hymn* than just regulating the contact with the divine. Mary Depew (2004) explored the context and objectives of the *Hymns*, highlighting the connections between the approach to Olympian gods and the "construction of Ptolemaic legitimacy", showing how the literary representation of Athena and Artemis can be connected to the Ptolemaic female royals.[98] Although the Ptolemaic queens were usually identified with Aphrodite, the stressing of the connection between Athena, Artemis and Zeus reflects the royal connection between the ruler and the female members of his household. By association with Zeus, the two goddesses are

[97] For a detailed analysis of the parallels in Callimachus, see Heath, 1992: 25-43.
[98] In the Milan Posidippus papyrus (that Depew suggests may have been written by Callimachus) the divinized queen Arsinoe appears holding a spear and a shield, being represented as an Athena-like figure.

depicted as royalty, and thus Tiresias and Actaeon's visual transgression is not only religious, because they are contemplating the naked bodies of goddesses that are, at the same time, maidens[99] and directly connected to the Olympian royalty. When transposing this dichotomy to the society where those hymns were written it reinforces the social boundaries that separate, not only the mysteries of the divine from mortal eyes, but also aristocracy from the common and men from women. The two mythological men serve as examples of the harsh punishment for someone who did not respect the privacy of the female body. That is indeed the social relevance of these myths: the exposition of the transgression of society's *nomoi*, an example of non-acceptable behaviour, and a harsh punishment to serve as warning for the next person that intends to cast his eyes upon what does not belong to him.[100]

Both myths are examples of the same divine and social transgression, based on sexual grounds. Although there are different versions of the destruction of Actaeon and the blinding of Tiresias, all of them shared fundamentally a context of sexual transgression - Actaeon's sexual interest in Semele/ Artemis/ seeing Artemis naked; Tiresias killing the copulating snakes/ revealing the most well-kept sexual secret in the world/ seeing Athena naked. In Callimachus' version, the transgression occurs in a very erotic environment – the bath – with a much-sexualized context – the naked virgin goddesses bathing – and both are punished for the act of gazing on the naked, forbidden, unreachable body.[101]

[99] The other known myth where a mortal man is punished for gazing at a goddess while she bathes is told by Ptolemy Hephaestion (*Nov. Hist.* 1), according to whom Aphrodite blinded Erymanthus, son of Apollo, because he saw her bathing after the union with Adonis. Although it follows a similar structure to the other bath myths, we do not know anything else of this tradition. For this see Sir James Frazer's translation of Apollodorus (p.363) and Westermann's *Mythographi Graeci* p.183. Antoninus Liberaris (17) tells us that Siproites was transformed into a woman because he saw Artemis bathing, which is possibly a mixture of the traditions of Actaeon and Tiresias.

[100] This is the warning that Gyges makes to Candaules in the famous story by Herodotus, that will be considered in this chapter.

[101] These conclusions – the regulation of the contact with the divine, while providing a message of social relevance – are similar to the ones I make concerning the myth of Pasiphae, in the third chapter.

From what we can deduce from the information provided in the surviving sources, these myths at least hint at how the act of gazing on the body of a respectable female, other than a man's wife, would be socially interpreted. We can further argue that this would not only reflect the reality of 3rd century Alexandria, but also in archaic/classical Athens, to where we can trace the earliest form of these myths.

1.3.3. Pentheus

As was stated in the introduction of this chapter, several of the references to voyeurism in ancient Greece perceptible in modern scholarship have their focus on Pentheus, the one that, as Dodds (1960: xiii) puts it, has the "sexual curiosity of a Peeping Tom". He points to two major examples of these 'voyeuristic' desires in the *Bacchae*. One is the first intervention of Pentheus in the tragedy, where he announces his return to Thebes and how he became aware of the maenadic revelry, where the women of the city were "slinking off to the wild to serve the lust of males, with the pretext of being maenads sacrificing, but in fact putting Aphrodite before Bacchos".[102] For Dodds (1960: 99), the emphasis on the sexual scenario is significant for Pentheus' psychology, not only defined by repulsion towards the mysteries of Dionysus and what they entail, but also unconscious sexual desire that, at the end of the play, led him to his demise.

Dodd's second example is when Pentheus had already been lured by Dionysus to witness the women's actions with his own eyes:

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ
κρύψῃ σὺ κρύψιν ἥν σε κρυφθῆναι χρεών,
ἐλθόντα δόλιον μαινάδων κατάσκοπον.

ΠΕΝΘΕΥΣ

[102] Eur. *Bac.* 221-223. Seaford (Trans.)

καὶ μὴν δοκῶ σφᾶς ἐν λόχμαις ὄρνιθας ὡς
λέκτρων ἔχεσθαι φιλτάτοις ἐν ἔρκεσιν.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ
οὐκοῦν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸ τοῦτ᾽ ἀποστέλλῃ φύλαξ:
λήψῃ δ᾽ ἴσως σφᾶς, ἢν σὺ μὴ ληφθῇς πάρος.

DIONYSUS
You will be hidden in the way that you should be hidden,
for one who comes as a cunning spy on maenads.

PENTHEUS
And indeed I suppose them to be in the thickets like birds,
held in the most pleasant nets of love-making.

DIONYSUS
Are you not sent off as a guardian against this very thing?
You will probably catch them, if you are not caught beforehand.[103]

Here, I believe that Dionysus is ironically alluding to Pentheus' future, since he will spy (κατάσκοπον) on the maenads. What Pentheus anticipates that he will see is mentioned: he expects to witness an erotic scenario where a high number of persons are engaging in sexual debauchery. That is what he anticipates from his first intervention in the play (221-223).

Although the opinion on the main topic of the *Bacchae* is firmly asserted in the academy[104] - the dramatization of the myth of Pentheus, the most famous opponent of the cult of Dionysus, and how he meets his demise for not accepting the god – the topic of his visual transgression is not so agreed. Although never denying that the reason for Pentheus' destruction is his divine transgression, Dodds believes that Euripides intentionally added the sexual curiosity element to Pentheus, probably to make him different from Hippolytus, whom he classifies as "fanatical, but with a touching and

[103] Eur. *Bac*. 955-959. Tr. Seaford.
[104] Dodds (1960: xxv). The story of Pentheus and Agave is one of a series of cult-legends which describe the punishment of those rash mortals who refused to accept the religion of Dionysus. Roux (1970: 37): "La violation des mystères bacchiques était évidemment aux yeux du public la faute capitale de Penthée". Rocha Pereira (1992: 10) "O mito – reacção de um monarca à introdução do culto dionisíaco e subsequente castigo pelo deus…"; Kovacs (2002: 2) "In *Bacchae* the poet has dramatized one of several stories about the resistance offered to the worship of Dionysus when the god was first introduced into Greece".

heroic fanaticism".[105] Barnard (1933) notes the incongruence between Pentheus' speech and attitude, since his main line of objection to the cult was the breach of appropriate sexual behaviour, however, as soon as the disguised Dionysus proposes to show him everything in secret, he "jumps at the chance of playing the role of Peeping Tom".[106] The sexual element is also considered by Gregory (1985), who starts her article by asking if Pentheus can be considered a voyeur, dwelling on Dodds' arguments. She is correctly aware that modern discussions on voyeurism, classifying it as a mental disorder and sexual aberration, are not properly adaptable to the ancient world, since the Greeks focused on the social boundaries that the voyeur transgressed, instead of his mental state; a fact that is perceptible in the innocence of the transgressor in most of the visual offences myths. However, Gregory dismisses the importance of the sexual longings of Pentheus in his final punishment, arguing that if he is also moved by the desire to see the naked maenads, that "from a Greek point of view, is altogether to be expected".[107] In her opinion, Pentheus' final offence is indeed a visual transgression[108] (although not sexual), for seeing what he was not prepared to see – the secret rites of Dionysus.[109] I believe that Gregory's view catches the essence of the moment, where Pentheus is further motivated by a sexual curiosity that would not be considered uncommon, although it is not the central factor in his final demise.

Seaford's interpretation is similar to Gregory's. He does not discuss the importance of sexual desire in Pentheus' action like Dodds. In his analysis of verses 221-223, Seaford does not deny Pentheus's assumption of the sexual revelry encompassed in

[105] Dodds (1960: xliii). Dodds quotes Hartung's reference to Pentheus "libidinosa spectandorum secretorum cupido".
[106] Barnard, 1933: 172.
[107] Gregory, 1985: 27.
[108] The motif of vision is amply explored throughout the entire tragedy, in fact being the play by Euripides with most references to vision. For the motif of vision in the *Bacchae* see Gregory, 1985 and Thumiger, 2013.
[109] Gregory (1985: 24) states that "From the ancient perspective the essential point about the man who 'sees what he should not see' is evidently not that he is disturbed or deviant, but that he has violated some prohibition and must be punished accordingly." She concludes that Greek males derive pleasure from visual sources, however there are restrictions, sexual and religious, that when transgressed motivate a heavy punishment.

the *thiasos*, stressing the connection with Pentheus' intervention a few verses after (454, 459, 487), where he accuses the stranger of wanting to have sex with the Theban women. However, when analysing 957-8, he does not share Dodds' opinion of a demonstration of the sexual curiosity of Pentheus. Seaford argues that although Pentheus' supposed interest in spying on the maenads in a sexual scenario might appear motivated by lust, he might also be simply interested in catching them in *flagrante delicto.*[110]

There is another part of the dialogue between Dionysus and Pentheus that deserves a closer look (810-816):

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ
ἆ.
βούλῃ σφ᾽ ἐν ὄρεσι συγκαθημένας ἰδεῖν;

ΠΕΝΘΕΥΣ
μάλιστα, μυρίον γε δοὺς χρυσοῦ σταθμόν.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ
τί δ᾽ εἰς ἔρωτα τοῦδε πέπτωκας μέγαν;

ΠΕΝΘΕΥΣ
λυπρῶς νιν εἰσίδοιμ᾽ ἂν ἐξῳνωμένας.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ
ὅμως δ᾽ ἴδοις ἂν ἡδέως ἅ σοι πικρά;

ΠΕΝΘΕΥΣ
σάφ᾽ ἴσθι, σιγῇ γ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἐλάταις καθήμενος

DIONYSUS
Do you wish to see (ἰδεῖν) them sitting together on the mountains?

PENTHEUS
Very much so and would give an enormous weight of gold to do so[111].

DIONYSUS
Why have you fallen into a great passion (ἔρωτα) for this?

[110] Roux (1972: 537) also argues that Pentheus is not motivated by lust. "Le roi n'est pas un « voyeur »; il ne se rend sur le Cithéron que pour rétablir l'ordre dans l'intérêt de la cité. Kovacs (2002: 9), also argues that there is no evidence that Pentheus was moved by any sort of scopophilia. As will be explained in a moment, I do not completely disagree with these versions. In my understanding, the sexual interest of Pentheus is not the main motivational factor behind his actions, however, I do believe that it is present in his actions.

[111] Barnard (1933: 172) reads this line as an example of Pentheus' lustful desire to see the maenads. When questioned by Dionysus if he would want to see them, the king states that he would trade a great amount of gold for the opportunity.

PENTHEUS
It would give me pain to see them drunk.

DIONYSUS
And yet you would enjoy seeing things that are bitter to you?

PENTHEUS
To be sure, sitting in silence under the firs.[112]

Seaford argues that although the "sudden ambivalent passion" might seem odd, it is not incoherent with other descriptions of mystical initiations.[113] Roux states that Pentheus is not moved by sexual desire[114] and Dodds makes no reference to these lines. I do not disagree with Seaford on this, since his analysis, based on our knowledge of Dionysiac mysteries, makes sense. However, Seaford never considers a possible sexual interest of Pentheus, believing that his transgression (the rejection of Dionysus and the final visual transgression of seeing what was denied to a non-initiand) are the only reasons for his destruction.

I am not arguing that the sexual longings of Pentheus are central to his fatality, however, Euripides does grant this character a noticeable sexual curiosity, which indeed further reinforces the connection between sexual visual transgression and religious offences, as I have discussed in the previous section. Pentheus is aware (or at least convinced) that the women gathering on the mountain have a shared sexual purpose. He himself argues that the women were "putting Aphrodite in front of Bacchus" (225). When provided with the opportunity to spy on them, without their knowledge, Pentheus immediately accepts. Taking into consideration the sexual scenario that he seems to

[112] Tr. Seaford.
[113] Seaford p.213. He quotes Aesch. *Fr*. 387; Max. Tyr. 39.3; Pl. *Phaedr*. 251-2; Soph. *Aj*. 685-5 as other sources were *eros* might be used to express the desire to be initiated.
[114] Roux, 1972: 494. "L'étranger ne doit pas se méprendre: le désir qu'éprouve le roi de voir les bacchantes n'a dáutre origine que le sentiment d'un devoir urgent à remplir, si pénible soit-il."

expect, this quick acceptance points to a certain degree of sexual curiosity that could be satisfied by secretly watching the maenads from afar.[115]

By entering a sexual scenario and seeing the women that he was not supposed to see, he is transgressing in a similar way to Actaeon and Tiresias. In the *Bacchae*, Pentheus is destroyed because he witnesses knowledge that was not supposed to be revealed to the uninitiated, however he is also committing the same transgression that we already explored in the bath myths: gazing on what was not his to see. Although the myth is considerable different from the ones in the *Bath of Pallas*, nevertheless it follows the same lines: gazing on someone in a sexualized environment and being punished for the transgression. The connection between Pentheus and Actaeon is constantly emphasised by Euripides.[116] The reference to the fate of Actaeon is far from innocent. He is another of Cadmus' descendants that has been destroyed because, in some way, he meddled with the gods, and the way he is killed shares an obvious resemblance with the myth of Pentheus. As I explored in the previous section, despite the different versions of Actaeon's transgression, they all share a sexual element. The visual transgression of Pentheus is mirrored in Actaeon's, and this similarity is corroborated by the shared fatality: both are destroyed by *sparagmos*.

The idea of a man climbing a tree to secretly spy on someone in a private situation has indeed been crystalized in the conception of the voyeur until today. It is perceptible in the legend of Lady Godiva, where Peeping Tom gazes at her, hidden behind his window, or how in modern cinema the young Renato climbs the tree next to Malena's home, in 2000's *Malèna,* so he can gaze at the most beautiful woman in town in secret. However, the most famous copying of Pentheus' behaviour is told by Tacitus (*Ann*. 11.31)

[115] Seaford's reading that Pentheus' desire to witness the maenads is not sexual, but simply the desire to catch them committing a crime, is obviously valid and coherent with the play, however it is not incompatible with sexual longing to spy on women in debauchery.
[116] Eur. *Ba*. 230; 337-41; 1227; 1291; 1372. Heath (1992: 11ff) establishes a comparison between the two cousins, basing his theory on the fact that both, literally and metaphorical, are depicted as hunter. To him, Actaeon's destruction at the beginning of the Bacchae and Pentheus' demise at the end "form a frame within which the hunting image operates".

when he writes about the bacchanal promoted by Messalina, where Vettius Valens[117] (another of Messalina's lovers) climbed a tree. Although his intention was not to spy on the maenads, it is a clear remembrance of the most famous visual transgressor of antiquity. In the *Bacchae*, Pentheus' visual transgression seems to be partially motivated by sexual intentions. It is not the main reason behind his capital offence and consequent punishment, but he indeed is a man that is under the impression that, in a certain place at a certain time, a group of women is engaging in sexual activities, under the pretext of a religious celebration, and he willingly (although played by Dionysus) goes to said place, disguised as one of those women, and climbs a tree to watch them from a distance, hoping to do it in secrecy. Therefore, we can argue that the subjects of the three myths explored share two major motifs: they all commit an offence against the gods and are therefore harshly punished; and all their transgressions share sexual traits. Pentheus expects to find women engaging in sexual debauchery; Tiresias and Actaeon gaze the naked body of a goddess. As I noted, before, the bath myths not only provide an important lesson – do not gaze the naked body of a woman that is not under your power – but more specifically the naked body of someone of a higher social status. This is also observable in the story of Gyges and Candaules, as I explore in the following section.

1.4. Looking at Royalty: Candaules and Gyges

The story of Gyges and Candaules is mainly conveyed in two ancient sources: Plato's *Republic*[118] and Herodotus' *Histories.*[119] There is an ongoing discussion on the

[117] For a brief account of Messalina's life see Rodrigues (2003).

[118] According to Plato (*Rep*. 359c-e), Gyges was a herdsman who found a magic ring that conferred invisibility on the holder, and he used it to kill the king, Candaules, after seducing his wife, the queen, who helps him in the murderous task.

[119] It was also told by Xanthus of Lydia. On the subject see Griffin, 2007: 50. Although Plato's and Herodotus' accounts are the most famous, the tale was also told by Nicholas of Damascus (possibly basing

sources that both authors had at their disposal; whether they had access to two different versions of the story and that is reflected in their own re-telling; or if there was only one single, longer source that both used, or even if Plato based his account on Herodotus, inventing his own version.[120] In this section I will focus on Herodotus' account:[121]

οὗτος δὴ ὧν ὁ Κανδαύλης ἠράσθη τῆς ἑωυτοῦ γυναικός, ἐρασθεὶς δὲ ἐνόμιζέ οἱ εἶναι γυναῖκα πολλὸν πασέων καλλίστην. ὥστε δὲ ταῦτα νομίζων, ἦν γάρ οἱ τῶν αἰχμοφόρων Γύγης ὁ Δασκύλου ἀρεσκόμενος μάλιστα, τούτῳ τῷ Γύγῃ καὶ τὰ σπουδαιέστερα τῶν πρηγμάτων ὑπερετίθετο ὁ Κανδαύλης καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς γυναικὸς ὑπερεπαινέων. χρόνου δὲ οὐ πολλοῦ διελθόντος （χρῆν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς ） ἔλεγε πρὸς τὸν Γύγην τοιάδε. 'Γύγη, οὐ γὰρ σε δοκέω πείθεσθαι μοι λέγοντι περὶ τοῦ εἴδεος τῆς γυναικός （ὦτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἐόντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν） , ποίεε ὅκως ἐκείνην θεήσεαι γυμνήν.' ὃ δ' ἀμβώσας εἶπε 'δέσποτα, τίνα λέγεις λόγον οὐκ ὑγιέα, κελεύων με δέσποιναν τὴν ἐμὴν θεήσασθαι γυμνήν; ἅμα δὲ κιθῶνι ἐκδυομένῳ συνεκδύεται καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ γυνή. πάλαι δὲ τὰ καλὰ ἀνθρώποισι ἐξεύρηται, ἐκ τῶν μανθάνειν δεῖ: ἐν τοῖσι ἓν τόδε ἐστί, σκοπέειν τινὰ τὰ ἑωυτοῦ. ἐγὼ δὲ πείθομαι ἐκείνην εἶναι πασέων γυναικῶν καλλίστην, καὶ σέο δέομαι μὴ δέεσθαι ἀνόμων.'

This Candaules, then, fell in love with his own wife, so much so that he believed her to be by far the most beautiful woman in the world; and believing this, he praised her beauty beyond measure to Gyges son of Dascylus, who was his favorite among his bodyguard; for it was to Gyges that he entrusted all his most important secrets. After a little while, Candaules, doomed to misfortune, spoke to Gyges thus: "Gyges, I do not think that you believe what I say about the beauty of my wife; men trust their ears less than their eyes: so you must see her naked." Gyges protested loudly at this. "Master," he said, "what kind of a sick suggestion, that I should see my mistress naked! When a woman's clothes come off, she dispenses with her modesty, too. Men have long ago made wise rules from which one ought to learn; one of these is that one

himself on the Lydian historian Xanthos), Plutarch (*Quaest. Graec.* 301f-302a), among other brief descriptions. For a summary on the sources, see Danzig, 2008: 169.

[120] For a summary of this discussion, see Danzig, 2008.

[121] Despite the historical claim of the narrative, it is argued that this tale may be based on a myth or popular folklore, which is not uncommon in Herodotus (Danzig (2008) provides a succinct approach to the problem of historicity in Herodotus). Gould (1980: 53) expresses the opinion that he sees no reason to call this historical narrative, considering it a myth although Herodotus might have thought of it as history. For him "the story of Gyges clearly deals with the theme of the abnormal succession of male power through the violation of the boundaries that separate women from unrelated males". Griffin (2007: 46) argues over the possibility of tragic influences in the story stating that it developed "from a simple folktale pattern, by creating the crucial dialogue between Gyges and the queen: she faces him with a moral decision like that of Agamemnon at Aulis, deciding to sacrifice his daughter or that of Orestes, confronting his wicked mother, and the story takes on a tragic colour". In fact, this tale is echoed in a fragment of a papyrus of an Attic tragedy, found in 1950, where the queen spots Gyges when he exits the room. Said (2002: 132) had already noted the similarities between Herodotus's account and the Aschylean tragedy, not only because of the human motivation but also the supernatural predisposition of the scene since disaster had to befall Candaules. Addressing the connection with tragedy, Said (135) furthermore adds that the usage of three main characters motivates connections with Attic tragedy. She had already noticed that similarities with the fragmentary papyrus, although stating that there was no consensus concerning the date of the fragment: whether it is pre-Herodotus or after the historian's account (Said 2002: 133). On that subject, Griffin (2007: 50) adds that today it is widely accepted that the tragic version of Gyges and Candaules is later than Herodotus, and largely based on the historian's account. Despite the discussion over the historicity of this story, I believe that the historical validity of the Candaules and Gyges episode is not necessary for this thesis. The main point of interest for me are the set of values in play in this episode, namely the power of looking associated with a transgression, the different social positions of the characters; the queen's sense of shame when another man sees her naked and the eventual demise of Candaules as punishement for his transgression.

should mind one's own business. As for me, I believe that your queen is the most beautiful of all women, and I ask you not to ask of me what is lawless." [122]

The beginning already points to the strange and outrageous character of the story. The first element is the immense passion that Candaules claims to feel for his wife (ἠράσθη τῆς ἑωυτοῦ γυναικός). By highlightly the sexual desire that Candaules had *for his own wife*, Herodotus seems to allude to the unusual aspect of this emotion. If we consider that having erotic desire for one's wife would be socially acceptable, by emphasising the sentiment Herodotus is showing us that he finds it unusual. This has been noticed by several scholars. According to Russo (1983: 127), this erotic fixation is eccentric and violates custom. Asheri (2007: 82) emphasises that this sentence implies that Candaules desire is "an unusual occurrence in Herodotus'view". Baragwanath (2008: 97) compares Candaules' impulses to Oroite's "unexpected and precipitate" desire to kill Polycrates (3.120.1–121.1). Furthermore, the abnormality of Candaules' love is emphasised by his actions: choosing to reveal the naked body of his wife to Gyges. By pressing on this action, Candaules shows that the desire he feels for his wife does not conform to the typical husband-wife relationship. This is the second element. The request that Candaules makes of Gyges continues this abnormal stream of events, and this abnormality is clearly stated by the bodyguard when he says: "I ask you not to ask of me what is lawless" (καὶ σέο δέομαι μὴ δέεσθαι ἀνόμων). Gyges' statement can carry more than one meaning. First, as Packman (1991: 404) notes, there is no necessity for Gyges to see the naked queen to attest the king's word. Being an eastern absolutist monarch, the word of the king is to be followed without any type of objection, and the fact that Candaules insists that his bodyguard validates his opinion reinforces Gyges' kingly

[122] Hdt. 1.8. Tr. Godley.

qualities. This necessity that Candaules *autopsia*[123] does not agree with the king's royal prerogatives, and this unkingly behaviour will result in his downfall.

Second, Gyges' reluctance to accept the possibility of contemplating a beautiful woman disrobing herself, and particularly a woman of a higher social status, can hint at the general behaviour towards sexual visual transgression. The bodyguard's answer to the king's proposal is clear: he states that it is a sick thing to ask someone,[124] appealing to Candaules not to make him do something that is lawless, not according to custom, *anomoi*. Dillery (2004: 250) argues that, although Herodotus does not use the term *theatēs* in this sentence, it is implied in *theēsasthai gymnēn*, defending the view that in this situation the writer indeed means "peeping Tom". As Shapiro (2000: 96-98) observes, Gyges' *gnomai* articulate "shared social values" and attempt to force the listener to change his behaviour. The bodyguard first states that "Men have long ago made wise rules from which one ought to learn; one of these is that one should mind one's own business" (πάλαι δὲ τὰ καλὰ ἀνθρώποισι ἐξεύρηται, ἐκ τῶν μανθάνειν δεῖ: ἐν τοῖσι ἓν τόδε ἐστί, σκοπέειν τινὰ τὰ ἑωυτοῦ), colloquially meaning: Let each one look to his own.[125] Shapiro (2000: 97) notes that with this expression, Gyges presents a "universal paradigm for appropriate social interaction", thus contemplating the naked body of someone else's wife is against the social standards of lawful behaviour, it is *anomos*, it shames the woman who is gazed, removing her modesty (ἅμα δὲ κιθῶνι ἐκδυομένῳ συνεκδύεται καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ γυνή).[126]

Cairns (1996) comments on the literal connection between the queen's *chitōn* and her sense of *aidōs*, a reinforcement of the necessity of concealing a woman's body, and

[123] Flory (1978: 151) compares this moment with the episodes of Croesus and his wealth and Xerxes with his fleet.
[124] Godley's translation of *logon ouk hygiea* is "what an unsound suggestion", however I choose to adapt Shapiro's (2000: 96) translation "what kind of sick suggestion is that?".
[125] This seems to have been a common saying or proverb in antiquity. that was also attributed to Pittacus of Mytilene, who supposedly lived in the seventh-sixth century B.C.E. Asheri (2008: 82), also provides other examples where this proverb can be found. The reference to Pittacus is made in *Anth. Pal.* 7.89.
[126] This is another common saying used by Herodotus. As Asheri (2008: 82) notes, this 'is also quoted as a maxim by Theano, Pythagoras' wife' (Diog. Laert. VIII 43); cf. Ovid's paraphrase in *Am.* III 14 and 27f. Plutarch discusses and approves the proverb (*Mor*. 37d and 139c).

how the removal of the clothes transforms the woman's status, from someone that belongs in a community, playing a social role, to someone that ceases to belong to a social sphere to take part in a private one, shared only with her husband.[127] In Cairns' (1996: 83) own words:

> Candaules' suggestion, that Gyges should invade the privacy of the marital bedchamber, where abandonment of αἰδώς is permitted, confounds the categories of public and private and nullifies the relationship of honour and deference which exists between husband and wife on the one hand, and master, mistress, and subordinate on the other […]

The inclusion of Gyges in the only scenario where it is possible for a woman to remove her clothes, being free from her *aidōs* and being able to embrace her sensuality, nullifies the social acceptation provided by the husband-wife social connection. It breaches a profoundly rooted behavioural norm, and for that the perpetrator needs to be punished.

Despite the lucidity of Gyges' arguments, Candaules continues to argue in favour of the impious action, further developing the transgressional scenario:

> ὃ μὲν δὴ λέγων τοιαῦτα ἀπεμάχετο, ἀρρωδέων μὴ τί οἱ ἐξ αὐτῶν γένηται κακόν, ὃ δ᾽ ἀμείβετο τοῖσιδε. ‘θάρσεε, Γύγη, καὶ μὴ φοβεῦ μήτε ἐμέ, ὡς σέο πειρώμενος λέγω λόγον τόνδε, μήτε γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμήν, μὴ τὶ τοι ἐξ αὐτῆς γένηται βλάβος. ἀρχήν γὰρ ἐγὼ μηχανήσομαι οὕτω ὥστε μηδὲ μαθεῖν μιν ὀφθεῖσαν ὑπὸ σεῦ. ἐγὼ γάρ σε ἐς τὸ οἴκημα ἐν τῷ κοιμώμεθα ὄπισθε τῆς ἀνοιγομένης θύρης στήσω. μετὰ δ᾽ ἐμὲ ἐσελθόντα παρέσται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐς κοῖτον. κεῖται δὲ ἀγχοῦ τῆς ἐσόδου θρόνος: ἐπὶ τοῦτον τῶν ἱματίων κατὰ ἕν ἕκαστον ἐκδύνουσα θήσει, καὶ κατ᾽ ἡσυχίην πολλὴν παρέξει τοι θεήσασθαι. ἐπεὰν δέ ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου στείχῃ ἐπὶ τὴν εὐνήν κατὰ νώτου τε αὐτῆς γένῃ, σοὶ μελέτω τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν ὅκως μὴ σε ὄψεται ἰόντα διὰ θυρέων.’

> Speaking thus, Gyges resisted: for he was afraid that some evil would come of it for him. But this was Candaules' answer: "Courage, Gyges! Do not be afraid of me, that I say this to test you, or of my wife, that you will have any harm from her. I will arrange it so that she shall never know that you have seen her. I will bring you into the chamber where she and I lie and conceal you behind the open door; and after I have entered, my wife too will come to bed. There is a chair standing near the entrance of the room: on this she

[127] Soares (2014) explores the connections and social repercussions of dressing and undressing, not only in the story of Gyges and Candaules but in three different episodes told by Herodotus. Specifically working on this episode, Periander and Xerxes, she shows how tyrants that break social convention (these three episodes share a common leitmotif of dress/undress of women) meet their demise.

will lay each article of her clothing as she takes it off, and you will be able to look upon her at your leisure. Then, when she moves from the chair to the bed, turning her back on you, be careful she does not see you going out through the doorway."[128]

Candaules not only proposes a transgressive action but also plans the set for it to happen. The king states that he will arrange the moment so the queen will never know that Gyges saw her: the bodyguard will hide himself behind the door while the queen disrobes herself one piece at a time (κατὰ ἕν ἕκαστον).[129] Herodotus' choice of words is extremely suggestive, emphasizing the erotic charge of the moment by expressing the queen's phased removal of her clothes that, in this case, would be an extra-aphrodisiacal element for the viewer. Candaules provides the logistical requirements for the action to be perpetrated in secret, without the woman having knowledge that she is being watched.[130]

Not being able to refuse his king any longer, Gyges acquiesces, hides himself in the room and gazes upon the queen as she removes her garments (καὶ τιθεῖσαν τὰ εἵματα ἐθηεῖτο ὁ Γύγης). However, the plan did not work as Candaules expected, and the queen noticed Gyges as he quietly exited the room. Although feeling ashamed (αἰσχυνθεῖσα), she immediately starts planning Candaules' punishment.[131] Herodotus explains that the queen's actions are motivated by the fact that among the Lydians, and most barbarian peoples, being seen naked is a source of shame (παρὰ γὰρ τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι βαρβάροισι καὶ ἄνδρα ὀφθῆναι γυμνόν ἐς αἰσχύνην μεγάλην φέρει).[132]

We should consider what this expression would mean to a Greek person. Would they understand nudity, and specifically being seen naked, as a Lydian, therefore a

[128] Hdt. 1.9. Tr. Godley.
[129] For a study of the room of Candaules, see Purves, 2014.
[130] This is one of the crucial premises for the conceptualization of a voyeuristic act in modern society.
[131] As Baragwanath (2008: 97) notices, although Candaules' wife was right in assuming that her husband was the main culprit, although, considering the situation, her conclusion is somewhat strange. There is no explanation in the text for why she knew immediately that the husband was the one to blame.
[132] This, as argued by Asheri (2007: 83), is one example of the type of ethnographical comments that are common in Herodotus.

shameful event? Or would he overlook the situation, considering it an extravaganza of barbaric people?[133] According to Blanshard (2010: 16), the Greeks were aware that their attitude towards the naked body differed from the rest of the Mediterranean peoples. It was a sign of development, of a more civilized society. In Blanshard's words "Nudity only enters the scene once people are prepared to no longer go around continually armed". However, in this case, we are dealing specifically with female nudity, which was not a costume in ancient Greece.[134] This would be a common aspect between Greek and Lydian culture, whose similarities were recognized by ancient authors. Thucydides, for example, states that the Greeks had many customs similar to those of the barbarians, specifically the ones from Asia (Thuc. 1.6). Even more interesting, Herodotus seems to give his own opinion on the subject.[135] Although he does not specifically mention his own ideas on nudity, he does state (1.94) that the customs of the Lydians are similar to the ones of the Greeks, only diverging in one aspect: the prostitution of little girls (Λυδοὶ δὲ νόμοισι μὲν παραπλησίοισι χρέωνται καὶ Ἕλληνές, χωρὶς ἢ ὅτι τὰ θήλεα τέκνα καταπορνεύουσι) Herodotus connects the Greeks and the Lydians, stating that they are two different peoples

[133] Flory (1969: 104) makes an interesting remark. He starts by stressing that, accordingly to Reinhardt, Herodotus' erotic interest in the female nudity of the queen is rather un-Greek and follows this quotation with his own reflection, stating that "Un-Greek thought it may be, the evocation of voyeurism is convincing". It is not completely clear if Flory personally considers that this episode represents a voyeuristic scene, although that is the impression that I get from his words.

[134] Bonfante, 1989: 558-560. Lee (2015b: 194), approaching female nudity in Greek art, argues that, in general, females do not display their breasts or genitalia. The only situation where a proper Greek woman (this discussion between proper and improper is explored in the following sections) publicly exposes her breasts are in scenes of supplication (Lee exemplifies with the episode of Clytemnestra exposing her breasts to Orestes, to plea for mercy). Especially poignant is Hecuba's exposure of her breast to Hector (22.80-90), trying to persuade him not to face Achilles in battle, alluding to a mother's love for her son, exemplified with the exposure of the child-nurturing breast (for the relevance of breast-feeding representation in ancient Greek art see Cohen, 1997, where she also explores the Hecuba-Hector episode). Even when discussing representations of accidental exposure, Lee (192) argues that "Figures whose breasts are accidentally exposed are generally not proper Greek women, but maenads or nymphs, or other mythological figures in action such as Nikai, Aurae, or Nereids". However, she explores scenarios where women are depicted naked, such as in the depilation scene on a red-figure bell-*krater* by the Dinos painter (figure 3.14 in Lee's book), where the presence of Eros implies the erotic charge of the scene. Nevertheless, there is no depiction of a male figure gazing the scene. It was meant to be private, and said privacy is the key clause here, because it was not expected that a woman would show of her body to a spectator during depilation. We later explore the social boundaries of female exposure in Greek society.

[135] It is common to find personal comments of Herodotus in his stories. For more examples of this see Danzig 2008.

that share a common belief concerning morality, two peoples that share common social behaviour patterns, except in one specific situation.

In the story of Candaules, the actions of the king that shame his wife constitute a serious transgression of the accepted social behaviour and thus need to be punished:

τότε μὲν δὴ οὕτω οὐδέν δηλώσασα ἡσυχίην εἶχε. ὡς δὲ ἡμέρη τάχιστα ἐγεγόνεε, τῶν οἰκετέων τοὺς μάλιστα ὥρα πιστοὺς ἐόντας ἑωυτῇ, ἑτοίμους ποιησαμένη ἐκάλεε τὸν Γύγεα. ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν δοκέων αὐτήν τῶν πρηχθέντων ἐπίστασθαι ἦλθε καλεόμενος: ἐώθεε γὰρ καὶ πρόσθε, ὅκως ἡ βασίλεια καλέοι, φοιτᾶν. ὡς δὲ ὁ Γύγης ἀπίκετο, ἔλεγε ἡ γυνὴ τάδε. ‘νῦν τοί δυῶν ὁδῶν παρεουσέων Γύγη δίδωμί αἵρεσιν, ὁκοτέρην βούλεαι τραπέσθαι. ἢ γὰρ Κανδαύλεα ἀποκτείνας ἐμέ τε καὶ τὴν βασιληίην ἔχε τὴν Λυδῶν, ἢ αὐτόν σε αὐτίκα οὕτω ἀποθνήσκειν δεῖ, ὡς ἂν μὴ πάντα πειθόμενος Κανδαύλῃ τοῦ λοιποῦ ἴδῃς τὰ μὴ σε δεῖ. ἀλλ᾽ ἤτοι κεῖνόν γε τὸν ταῦτα βουλεύσαντα δεῖ ἀπόλλυσθαι, ἢ σε τὸν ἐμὲ γυμνήν θεησάμενον καὶ ποιήσαντα οὐ νομιζόμενα.’ ὁ δὲ Γύγης τέως μὲν ἀπεθώμαζε τὰ λεγόμενα, μετὰ δὲ ἱκέτευε μὴ μιν ἀναγκαίῃ ἐνδέειν διακρῖναι τοιαύτην αἵρεσιν. οὔκων δὴ ἔπειθε, ἀλλ᾽ ὥρα ἀναγκαίην ἀληθέως προκειμένην ἢ τὸν δεσπότεα ἀπολλύναι ἢ αὐτὸν ὑπ᾽ ἄλλων ἀπόλλυσθαι: αἱρέεται αὐτὸς περιεῖναι. ἐπειρώτα δὴ λέγων τάδε. ‘ἐπεί με ἀναγκάζεις δεσπότεα τὸν ἐμὸν κτείνειν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα, φέρε ἀκούσω τέῳ καὶ τρόπῳ ἐπιχειρήσομεν αὐτῷ.’ ἢ δὲ ὑπολαβοῦσα ἔφη ‘ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μὲν χωρίου ἡ ὁρμὴ ἔσται ὅθεν περ καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐμέ ἐπεδέξατο γυμνήν, ὑπνωμένῳ δὲ ἡ ἐπιχείρησις ἔσται.’

For the present she made no sign and kept quiet. But as soon as it was day, she prepared those of her household whom she saw were most faithful to her, and called Gyges. He, supposing that she knew nothing of what had been done, answered the summons; for he was used to attending the queen whenever she summoned him. When Gyges came, the lady addressed him thus: “Now, Gyges, you have two ways before you; decide which you will follow. You must either kill Candaules and take me and the throne of Lydia for your own, or be killed yourself now without more ado; that will prevent you from obeying all Candaules' commands in the future and seeing what you should not see. One of you must die: either he, the contriver of this plot, or you, who have outraged all custom by looking on me uncovered.” Gyges stood awhile astonished at this; presently, he begged her not to compel him to such a choice. But when he could not deter her, and saw that dire necessity was truly upon him either to kill his master or himself be killed by others, he chose his own life. Then he asked: “Since you force me against my will to kill my master, I would like to know how we are to lay our hands on him.” She replied, “You shall come at him from the same place where he made you view me naked: attack him in his sleep.”[136]

The queen presents Gyges with a terrible choice:[137] one most die, either Candaules who plotted the transgression; or Gyges, the one who physically perpetrated it. The words of the queen once again reinstate the seriousness of the actions of the two men: they broke the accepted social behaviour by gazing upon (and letting be gazed upon) the naked woman, and so punishment is required. Facing such hard options, Gyges chose to kill his

[136] Tr. Godley.

[137] It is interesting to observe that, despite Gyges not being the main culprit of this story, he still commits an offence that deserves punishment. As Said (2002: 132) noted Gyges is placed twice in a tragic situation, never being able to avoid committing a crime that he does not want to commit. Soares (2014: 223) highlights the degree of flexibility in the application of justice in this episode.

master and take his place as king of the Lydians and husband of Candaules' wife. As Soares (2014: 223-224) notes, the queen's revenge is motivated by more than just pure retribution. Since social rules state that a woman should only be seen naked by her husband, Candaules' actions open a precedent that could be hazardous to the queen's reputation. By offering Gyges the option to kill Candaules, she is giving him the opportunity to become her lawful husband, protecting her status and reputation. Cairns (1996: 82 n26) has a similar reading, arguing that, by intruding the marital chamber, Gyges needs to assume Candaules' place, both as king and husband, because it is the only way the bodyguard may share what should only belong to one man. The wife's ultimatum reinstates the equilibrium to the social scale of marriage and social status, remaining to be seen only by her husband or, in this case, husbands, instead of having been contemplated by a low-status man. After the murder of Candaules, Herodotus (1.13) tells how Gyges's kingship was confirmed by the oracle of Delphi but that she also prophesied that it would be a short dynasty, not meant to rule for longer than the fifth generation. Although Gyges desires to act rightly, he commits two grave transgressions: gazing on his queen naked and killing his king. And for that he receives some measure of punishment.[138]

Notwithstanding the historical claim of the narrative[139], this story has an educational purpose, like the myths that were already explored. There is an emphasis on correct values and social boundaries that should be respected thorough one's life.[140] What

[138] Danzig (2008) shows how the formulation of Gyges' innocence is only perceivable in Herodotus. Plato, for example, depicts him as a usurper. As Danzig (2008: 173) puts it, "no one was ever less responsible for murdering a king and assuming the crown than Herodotus' Gyges". For more examples of the same punishment for a sexual transgression in Herodotus, see section 4.3.

[139] On this see also section 4.3.

[140] On this point I believe Immerwahr (1985: 438) is right when he states that "Herodotus' work has not only a scientific function, but also an educational one. It explains to the Greek audience the standards by which they have lived and the standards by which they must live". Cartledge, Greenwood (2002: 368-9) and Dominick (2007: 436) note that by demonstrating this type of behaviour towards women by non-Greeks, such as the actions of Candaules and Xerxes at the end of his *Histories*, Herodotus shows the kinds of abomination that Greeks must avoid. Further than Candaules' actions, that are a most extreme case of lawless behaviour, the story of Atossa also demonstrates the shamefulness of the action of looking at the naked body of a woman.

we have in this story is a lawless husband who fails to protect his wife, and an accidental visual transgressor unable to resist his king's unlawful desires. Gyges is not motivated by sexual desire, so he is not properly a voyeur. He does not appear to have sexual intentions towards the queen, although he ends up marrying her, gaining sexual rights to the woman that he previously spied on, and in time he would suffer some measure of punishment, since it was prophesized that the Heraclidae family would have their revenge and return to the throne, and that Gyges' dynasty would not rule longer than the fifth generation (Hdt. 1.13.2). The story of Gyges and Candaules conveys an important social rule: do not look at the wife of another man, or, do not look at a woman that is not under your power, and specially do not gaze upon the naked body of a person of higher social status. Doing it transgresses the accepted social behaviour, motivating social punishment, and that is perceptible in Herodotus' account, as well as in the myths previously explored. Gyges' actions should never be repeated. No one should gaze on a free woman, other than his wife, naked. The intimacy between a couple should be safeguarded, protected by the walls of the bedroom. This seems to be the same in Greek and Lydian cultures. I further explore the boundaries of vision in social interactions in the following section.

1.5. Looking among each other

So far, I have discussed the sexual visual transgression towards gods and royalty, figures that held the highest possible social status. More specifically, I have discussed sexual visual transgression towards goddesses, queens and maenads, which already points to the conclusion that, if indeed there was a sense of sexual visual transgression in ancient Greece, most of the examples that we can trace are those perpetrated by men. Building on that initial analysis, a more significant approach to the wider social context is necessary, specifically to the context of women in ancient Greece.

In *Against Simon,* Lysias narrates the story of two men that are infatuated with a boy named Theodotus who supposedly preferred the approach of the orator's defendant instead of Simon's, and this preference motivated a violent reply from the accuser:

ἡγοῦμαι ταῦθ᾽ ὑμῖν προσήκειν ἀκοῦσαι. πυθόμενος γὰρ ὅτι τὸ μειράκιον ἦν παρ᾽ ἐμοί, ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐμὴν νύκτωρ μεθύων, ἐκκόψας τὰς θύρας εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν γυναικωνῖτιν, ἔνδον οὐσῶν τῆς τε ἀδελφῆς τῆς ἐμῆς καὶ τῶν ἀδελφιδῶν, αἳ οὕτω κοσμίως βεβιώκασιν ὥστε καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων ὁρώμεναι αἰσχύνεσθαι. οὗτος τοίνυν εἰς τοῦτο ἦλθεν ὕβρεως ὥστ᾽ οὐ πρότερον ἠθέλησεν ἀπελθεῖν, πρὶν αὐτὸν ἡγούμενοι δεινὰ ποιεῖν οἱ παραγενόμενοι καὶ οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐλθόντες, ἐπὶ παῖδας κόρας καὶ ὀρφανὰς εἰσιόντα, ἐξήλασαν βίᾳ

Hearing that the boy was at my house, he came there at night in a drunken state, broke down the doors, and entered the women's rooms: within were my sister and my nieces, whose lives have been so well-ordered that they are ashamed to be seen even by their kinsmen. This man, then, carried insolence to such a pitch that he refused to go away until the people who appeared on the spot, and those who had accompanied him, feeling it a monstrous thing that he should intrude on young girls and orphans, drove him out by force.[141]

Simon's invasion of the women's quarters is not the focus of the speech; however, the event was significant enough to deserve a detailed description. The orator seeks to depict Simon as a violent man that sought trouble by going to the defendant's house, simultaneously trying to show the correct behaviour of the defendant that constantly tries to avoid conflict (Todd 2007: 284). By describing the invasion of the woman's quarters, the orator accentuates Simon's transgressional behaviour and lack of regard for social standards, which was being described in a sense of ever-increasing aggravation since the start of the attacks' description: he arrives at night, drunk and invades the women's quarters.[142] His behaviour was so terrible, that his own companions felt the need to maintain some level of respect for social boundaries and forced him out of the house.[143]

[141] Tr. Lamb.

[142] As Todd (2007: 313) phrases it: "The force of the sentence is to cap one transgressive feature with another: i.e. he came by night, and what is more he was drunk. Being drunk during the daytime would in itself be even worse, but drunkness is portrayed as a characteristic of Simon at all times, and here the combination of the two underlines the violence of the night-time entry."

[143] Cohen (1991: 82) classifies entering the house by force, and especially forcing the way into the presence of women, as an act of hubris, that in this case connects sexuality and honour. Ormand (2009: 77-78), describes the invasion of the woman's quarters as a "paramount to a sexual violation". Corner (2011: 65), although not referring specifically to this episode, also notes that the penetration of the household was identified with the penetration of the body, and the action of a woman opening the door to an outsider may relate to adulterous behaviour. Centuries after Lysias, Plutarch (*Mor.* 516 E-F), describes a similar sense of

The account suggests a necessity of having women protected from masculine eyes, even when secluded in their own house. This seems to be an exaggeration by Lysias, aimed to paint Simon as a terrible, transgressive man. As Todd (2007: 314) states, this rule would not have been applied to relatives; however, it would be applicable to other men. The topic of segregation in ancient Greece, and specifically in ancient Athens, is still debatable today. Classical scholarship on the subject[144] generally argues that women in classical Athens had little autonomy, being secluded in their homes, and indeed several examples from ancient literature point to that. For example, in Sophocles' *Elektra* (516), Clytemnestra accuses her daughter of shaming her family because she wanders outside the palace. In Euripides' *Elektra* (341) it is stated that it is shameful for a woman to be standing with young men.[145] In Euripides' *Orestes*, Helen clearly states that it was not good for maidens to go into a crowd.[146] In the *Phoenissae*, Antigone only leaves her quarters (παρθενών) with her mother's consent (88ff.), later returning to the same chamber (193ff.). In *Iphigeneia at Aulis* (678-9; 735), Agamemnon warns his daughter and wife that they should avoid any contact with men. In the same play, the social boundaries separating men from women are most clear in the dialogue between Clytemnestra and Achilles, where the hero's coyness provoked by the possibility of being seen speaking with a woman of elevated social status is clear.[147] These references do seem to emphasise the importance of safeguarding women of high social status from the male gaze, which indeed is in line with what I have argued in the previous two sections.

---

feminine shame when saying that a guest should always knock before entering, in this way avoiding laying his eyes on the women of the house.

[144] Dover, 1974: 95-98; Pomeroy, 1975: 79-83; Walcot, 1984; Keuls, 1993: 82-112.
Ormand (2009: 48) "In theory, citizen women's lives were rigorously private. Wives were expected to stay indoors and not to wander about outside without an escort".
Lawrence (1973: 240) "Women could use the court when no strange men were present, and had their own quarters, shut off by a strong door – not so much to keep them safe from drunken guests as to segregate the male and female slaves at night".
Hartt (1976: 107) "[…] men were completely free to go where they wished, while women were generally restricted to the house, which they seldom left".

[145] γυναικί τοι αἰσχρὸν μετ᾽ ἀνδρῶν ἑστάναι νεανιῶν.

[146] ἐς ὄχλον ἔρπειν παρθένοισιν οὐ καλόν.

[147] Cairns (1993: 309-314) explores this episode.

Classical scholarship on the subject defends this conception of gender separation. According to Dover (1974: 95-98), strict segregation of the sexes was the best method for a father to ensure that his daughter could not have intercourse with anyone except her future husband. Notwithstanding, he also acknowledges that such a strict regime was impossible to be applied to all the women in Greece. For families that did not have the economic power to own several slaves it would be required of women to work. Pomeroy (1975: 79-82) follows Dover's opinion, recognizing the impossibility of segregation in poorer families, but mainly emphasizing that women were usually secluded in their houses, that were designed to separate men from women. Although recognizing the nuances that certainly existed, both focus mainly on exploring a scenario where female segregation was common.

More recent scholarship on the subject has moved away from this conception. In several of his works, David Cohen (1989, 1990, 1991, 1995) argues against the idea of seclusion, pointing that living a separated life from men does not mean that women were confined to their houses. His comparative approach between anthropological studies of small twentieth-century communities in Portugal, Spain, Greece, etc. and classical Athenian society, produced very interesting and compelling results. Describing classical Athens as a "face to face" community (1991: 133), Cohen provides a scenario where the topic of seclusion is not as rigid as the concept sounds, where most women were integrated in the most immediate community, bonding with neighbours and establishing friendships. As Cohen (1991: 85) states:

> *Philia* embodies an idea of friendship where privacy barriers are relaxed, tempering the antagonistic social relations associated with honor and shame (a social ethic expressed in the proverbial formula "honor" involves helping one's friends and harming one's enemies).

Cohen defends the idea that the daily life of women in classical Athens is better depicted by the comedies of Aristophanes, where the comediographer mentions, for example, a woman peeking out to the street to gaze upon a lovely man,[148] or a young girl waiting for her lover at home.[149] Although this vision is not incompatible with Dover's, as Cohen himself (1989: 12) admits, Dover focuses mainly on the conception of segregation and Cohen tries to show the other possibility.

If we look through an architectural perspective, through an analysis of the layout of the Greek house, the available evidence does not corroborate the imposition of feminine seclusion. Nevett (1999: 154-156), basing her conclusions on the archaeological evidence in Olynthus, argues that there is no proof of the "traditional literary-based model of a house split into separate male and female areas", since the house is organized around a central space that connects directly to every room. The finding of female utensils in several divisions of the house reinforces the conclusion that the women had access to every room, not being confined to one division only. The only room that seems to have had a specific functionality is the dining room, associated with the literary *andron*, that was indeed integrated in the layout of the *oikos*, although isolating devices[150] could be used to separate the visitors from the rest of the household. Trümper (2002: 292-93),[151] based on the same archaeological site, agrees with Nevett. She documents the same type of house, with a single entrance and which was organized around a central courtyard that gives access to every room. There could be some privacy if the rooms had doors, however the access was public, and everyone would be subjected to another household member's gaze.

[148] Ar. *Peace* 978ff.
[149] Ar. *Eccles*. 920.
[150] Nevett does not specify which devices were used. I believe that she is referring to curtains that would act as doors, barring visual access.
[151] Rabinowitz (2002: 115-119) shares the same view. Glazebrook and Mellor (2013: 38) argue that the internal courtyard helped to keep the women from the gaze of men, that were usually confined to the *andron* that did not usually have a direct view over the courtyard. This way, women would not only be shielded from the eyes of their masculine family, but also of contact with any male outsider. Corner (2011) argues that every room, except the *andron*, had a flexible usage and that women's work would take them all over the house.

For the Athenian reality, Pomeroy (1975: 80) says that the separation of men and women is perceptible in domestic architecture. Nevett (2005: 84), disagrees with this vision, arguing that excavations, in both Athens and other large settlements, have revealed the most common house's typology to be the single-entrance, courtyard house, with no specific divisions meant to separate the members of the household by gender. Nevertheless, the houses in Athens follow the same model of closed interiors as the ones from Olynthus, suggesting the desire to control the contact between the members of the household and the outside community. Nevett also adds that both in Olynthus and in Athens there are remains of very small houses where even the separation between the members of the household and outsiders would be virtually impossible.

Although such findings are remarkable, they do not set a final point on the argument of seclusion. They hint, and are effective in showing that the most common house is not built to provide the level of seclusion to which some literary sources allude, however there is a void of knowledge that makes it impossible to completely settle this discussion. Most of the evidence for the Greek house did not survive, such as upper floors, which means that we cannot identify physical remains of houses such as the one of Euphiletus (Lys. 1). This house would differ from the common typology explained by Nevett and Trümper since it is described that the women's quarters were on the upper floor, being accessed through a ladder, and the wife's room would have a door with a lock.

The sources clearly show that we cannot deal in absolutes. We have enough information that points to the conclusion that in Athens there would be seclusion of women and women that could not be secluded. Common sense dictates that most families could not afford segregating part of the work force necessary for their daily subsistence. As Dover (1974: 98) states, the level of women's segregation would differ according to the social status, wealth and the number of slaves available to do the required errands. It would be impossible for poor families to have the number of slaves required to perform

the work necessary for the daily needs, and women of rural families would certainly have contributed to the agricultural work, as still happens today.

Segregation could have been a reality in aristocratic families,[152] being the best way to ensure that a daughter would not have sexual intercourse before marriage and it would be customary for the husband to continue such confinement, isolating his wife as far as possible from contact with other men (Dover 1974: 98). However, even within aristocratic families segregation may not have always been a clear practice. Festivals, for example, were a time when the social boundaries of respectable women were relaxed. They organized great public events such as the Thesmophoria (Isaeus 8.19-20; 3.80; 6.49) which would provide them with the opportunity to spend three days outside, without male control.[153] The fact that certain families could not afford to seclude their women, does not mean that they did not exercise the ideology behind the action – sexual control - shielding the women from the outsider's gaze, in any way they could. As Llewellyn-Jones (2003; 2007) shows, there is a correlation between the protecting walls of the house and the clothes, specifically the veil, of a woman. Inside the house, the visual contact between women and men could be controlled by curtains and wooden partitions and outside it was prevented by their garments and veils that covered the head and shoulders and some even covered their faces.[154] In Menander's opinion (*Pk.* 311-312), women should always have

[152] The literary examples quoted before are from aristocratic contexts.

[153] If we consider the weight that religious festivals had on the Greek calendar, we are faced with the conclusion that women spent more time outside than classical scholarship on seclusion states. When discussing this point, Cohen (1991: 152) points out that the organization of great public religious events would require a massive contact between women, that would obviously make them leave the house to meet. In his own words: "Indeed, historians have failed to explore the social implications of the fact that Athenian women's networks were organized enough to carry out the full range of activities associated with such an undertaking, including election of officials and a governing council, rehearsals, supplies, finances, etc. In fact, Athenian priestesses were public officials, and were subject to the same public audits as male officials (Aeschines 3, 18). This degree of organization and subjection to public scrutiny and accountability suggests that women were well able to cope with the demands of their sphere of public life. Indeed, it is scarcely imaginable that any of this could take place if they were confined to the home and embarrassed to be seen by any men other than close relatives. In Athenian society religion occupied an important place in civic life, and within it women played a central role".

[154] Glazebrook and Mellor, 2013: 38; Llewellyn-Jones, 2007. However, as Llewellyn-Jones (2003: 122) notes, despite the fact that use of the veil may have been a reality in lower-class women, based on the same ideology of the respectability of the female, in rural areas where sometimes it was required of women to work the land alongside other men, it would be impractical to use it. Although the veil could be a visual differentiation point between respectable women and prostitutes, there are accounts of hetairai that used the

their veil at hand, even indoors. The lack of protection provided by these garments exposes the woman to the outsider's gaze, inflicting desire in his eye. Athenaeus (590c), tells how Periander fell in love with Melissa, when he saw her serving wine to young men with no cloak on, only a single tunic.[155] No matter the socio-economic differences of Athenian families, they shared a culture in a specific time and place. A culture that was marked by separation of girls and boys, women and men, to maintain social equilibrium and peace.[156]

This cultural separation is evident in Isocrates. In his letter to Archidamos III of Sparta, Isocrates seeks to convince the Spartan king to lead the Hellenic world against Persia that under the Peace of Antalcidas had gained control and exerted influence on several Greek *poleis*, especially in Ionia. When expressing the destruction of Greek cities by the Persians, Isocrates (9.10) highlights the treatment of Hellenic women:[157]

> τῶν δὲ τὰς οὐσίας διαρπάζοντες, ἔτι δὲ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας ὑβρίζοντες, καὶ τὰς μὲν εὐπρεπεστάτας καταισχύνοντες, τῶν δ᾽ ἄλλων ἃ περὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἔχουσι περισπῶντες, ὥσθ᾽ ἃς πρότερον οὐδὲ κεκοσμημένας ἦν ἰδεῖν τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις, ταύτας ὑπὸ πολλῶν ὁρᾶσθαι γυμνάς, ἐνίας δ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐν ῥάκεσι περιφθειρομένας δι᾽ ἔνδειαν τῶν ἀναγκαίων.
>
> [...] they treat with indignity children and women, and not only dishonor the most beautiful women, but from the others they strip off the clothing which they wear on their persons, so that those who even when fully clothed were not to be seen by strangers, are beheld naked by many men; and some women, clad in rags, are seen wandering in destitution from lack of the bare necessities of life.[158]

First, Isocrates conveys the social boundaries that we have been exploring in this chapter. Women used clothes that covered their entire body, however the social convention is that no one should look at them in the first place. That is Isocrates'

---

veil. This will be discussed in point 6. For a more detailed discussion on the use of curtains see Llewellyn-Jones, 2003: Ch. 7.

[155] For a further analysis of this episode see Llewellyn-Jones, 2003: 176-177.

[156] Walcot (1984: 38) called the segregation of women in Athenian society a "safety-valve", that protected women's integrity and prevented the necessity of violence to defend them. In a way, it is not much different from several societies of the 21st century.

[157] I return to this text in section 2.4.3.

[158] Isoc. *L.* 9. For the context of the Peace of Antalcidas see Norlin's commentary in his translation of Isocrates for Loeb (1928: 117-118).

conception of how men and women should act in their daily life. By previously explaining this, he is able to emphasize the magnitude of the Persians' criminal behaviour towards Greek women. Dragging them into the street, after raping the most beautiful women in town, they rip the women's clothes from their bodies, uncovering what should not be seen, making it visible to every man. This behaviour, in Isocrates' opinion, epitomisesa barbaric society. A similar transgression is narrated by Herodotus (5.92). Periander, the tyrant of Corinth, forced all the Corinthian women to disrobe, to appease the ghost of his late wife, Melissa, and persuade her to reveal the secret location of a buried treasure.[159]

Although physical seclusion was not such a widespread activity as some classical scholarship seems to suggest, ancient Greek social construction dictated that women should not have direct contact with men. This is the notion expressed in Isocrates, notwithstanding specific situations where such a rule might be avoided, such as a certain familiarity between the members of one household and its immediate neighbours, as Cohen shows. The social barriers erected between male and female were the stronghold of female sexual morality, and consequently protected masculine honour, always vulnerable through women.[160] Those barriers were daily reinforced by informal channels of control such as gossip[161] that could permanently destroy a woman's reputation.[162] Therefore, it becomes clear that in ancient Greece, and more specifically in Athens, there existed powerful restrictions on the contact between men and women, not only physical but also visual. The walls of the house and its public extension, the veil, make it impossible for a man to gaze upon a respectable woman, although the socially approved behaviour dictates that he should never try to look at her in the first place.

[159] For this episode see Soares, 2014.
[160] For a brief exposition of the connection between women and men's honour see Cairns 1993: 120-126.
[161] For a brief account of the power of gossip in modern villages, see Cohen's chapter *Models and methods II*.
[162] Cohen 1991: 64. Cohen quotes a passage from the Funeral Oration of Pericles that provides a very brief but certainly accurate account of the importance of gossip in a woman's life: "the greatest glory of woman is to be least talked about by men, whether they are praising you or blaming you". Lysias (7.18-19) states that eaves-dropping and gossip are common among the members of the neighbourhood.

Considering this, we should think about what such restrictions would mean, not only for adult men but especially for boys and girls during puberty.[163] In classical Athens, a boy might grow up near a girl of his own age, without almost ever seeing her. The possibility for a love affair with the neighbour's daughter would be almost impossible (Dover, 1968: 209), not to mention dangerous, considering that seducing the unmarried daughter constituted *moicheia*. Even so, Xenarchus (Ath. 13.569a-569b) feels the need to criticize young men that pursue freeborn women, emphasizing that it was quite cheap to buy pleasure, which shows that there were those brave enough to risk the penalty for seduction. From an early age, a boy would possibly have contact with the female body, either by contemplating prostitutes in the streets, or when his father starts to include him in the symposium, where prostitutes would provide him with the opportunity to get acquainted with the female body. However, that does not substitute the desire to behold someone of his own age, or any woman that he might possibly marry.[164] They were raised in a culture that bars contact with a possible companion, and the same for girls, whose sexual education in most cases would be composed solely of stories told by older women.[165] During puberty, boys in ancient Athens might have the possibility of sexual contact with women and even older men, but with no woman that could become his wife. Girls would have even less contact, since they were meant to be protected from the male gaze by the walls of her father's home, and the thickness of her garments and veil. There is a certain level of curiosity that we cannot properly grasp, considering the sexual freedom that we live in today in the Western world. That curiosity is what motivates transgressional behaviour.

[163] The *DSM-V* indicates that voyeuristic disorder starts to manifest during adolescence.

[164] There are several references to the sexual activity between husband and wife. Isocrates (3.40) condemns the men that disrespect their wife by having intercourse with other women, stressing the pain that action brings her. Ischomachus claims that the physical pleasure of sex with his wife is far greater proportionately than with slaves, because it is desired and not bought (Glazebrook and Mellor, 2013: 46).

[165] Not only on young women, but seclusion by itself could motivate the development of erotic passions. When approaching Phaedra in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, Cairns (1993: 327-328) argues that the seclusion of women could motivate destructive passions. Davidson (1997: 127-128) also suggests that seclusion could produce sexual desire and active sexual actions.

Already in 1973, Dover seems to consider a similar idea:

> Consider now the situation of an adolescent boy growing up in such a society. Every obstacle is put in front of his speaking to the girl next door; it may not be easy for him even to get a glimpse of her. Festivals, sacrifices and funerals, for which women and girls did come out in public, provided the occasion for seeing and being seen. They could hardly afford more than that […]
> In a society which practices segregation of the sexes, it is likely that boys and girls should devote a good deal of time and ingenuity to defeating society, and many slaves may have co-operated with enthusiasm.

Although continuing in the line of a strict segregation of the sexes, Dover has in consideration the curiosity for the opposite sex that would be developed during adolescence, and fuelled by the separation of boys and girls, and how that would motivate them to break the existing system.[166] The woman in Aristophanes' *Peace*, hoping to be able to peek out to the street to lay her eyes on her loved one, is not taking into consideration that such behaviour is not socially sanctioned. In the *Ecclesiazusae*, as soon as his wife, Praxagora, arrives home, Blepyrus immediately asks where she spent her time, suspecting that she had been with another man. Cohen (1990: 161) establishes a relation between ancient Athens and the small community of Harouch, where young boys would stand on the balcony of the house, gazing at the young women as they were going to the fountain. Being aware of this, the girls would make more trips to the fountain to extend the moment, even if it is a transgressional one. Archaeological evidence shows that houses in ancient Athens were built very closely to each other, suggesting, as Cohen remarks (1991: 88), that there existed a more significant interaction and intimacy between household members than some sources seem to imply, however that does not mean that such proximity was expressed between genders. The primary type of attachments would continue to reflect the social separation of genders. The extreme physical proximity of the houses in a society where attachment distance between masculine and feminine is the

[166] Soares (2008: 33), when exploring the conception of nomos, transgression and identity in Herodotus, phrases a similar idea concerning the prominence of social-boundaries breaking behaviour among younger people. As she puts it: "De facto constata-se que, tal como sucede hoje, o grupo etário mais propenso a questionar e, muitas vezes, romper com as normas estabelecidas é o dos jovens."

common rule, would only aggravate the youngster's curiosity, and additionally motivate system-breaking behaviour. In Menander's *Georgos,* a young man has sex with his neighbour. In *Samia*, another young man rapes but later marries his neighbour. Euphiletus' wife, one of the most famous examples of adultery in Athens, lives in a state of seclusion within the conception of classical scholarship, but even so, she was seduced by another man after being spotted at a funeral. There was a breach in social and physical boundaries that prevent a woman of becoming the object of a man's gaze, a visual transgression that led to adultery.

Independently of the economic power of the family or of the actual seclusion of women when it can be afforded, the rules that guide social interaction are the same for anyone that wants to be shown as a respectable woman. The respectable woman attempts to avoid being the subject of male gaze, to interact with men outside of her household or, as far as possible, her near neighbours and friends of the family that were accepted into the *oikos*. This sort of behaviour separates respectable women from the "other", prostitutes that are on display, show themselves on the street and speak to men, attempting to lure them inside. The respectable man, such as Achilles when he faces Clytemnestra, knows that it is uncommon and against social norms to be in direct contact with the wife of another man, and especially a woman of high social status, and so such action should be avoided, to protect himself, the woman's reputation and, by inference, the husband's honour. These rules change, when we consider looking at women that were not recognized as respectable or were of lower social status, as I explain in the following section.

1.6. Looking at prostitutes

> In the sixth century B.C., the Athenian lawgiver Solon institutionalized the distinction between good women and whores.[167]

This affirmation by Pomeroy (1975: 57) is merely one example of the conception of prostitutes in antiquity grouped together, with no differentiation among them, and in opposition to the example of the good wife. This sort of categorization was most vehemently criticized by Davidson (1997), arguing that the massification of a concept, including the entire miscellaneous group of sex workers, fails to provide a realistic view on prostitution in ancient Athens.

It is safe to argue that the study of prostitution in the ancient world is rather complicated. Different terminologies, different categorizations of prostitute, and the unreliability of the sources (we do not possess any account by a prostitute herself) make it virtually impossible to have a clear image of prostitution. Modern scholarship tends to separate *pornai*, a slave who worked in a brothel for a fee, *hetairai*, supposedly of a free status, longer term companions of men[168], who some scholars see as the top of their social scale,[169] and even *pallakai*, long-term companions living in the house of one man.[170] This separation partly reflects Apollodorus' (Dem. 59.122) famous division of women in three categories – *hetairai* for pleasure, *pallakai* for daily necessities of the body, and *damar* for reproduction – establishing the dichotomy between the lawful wife and the courtesan, between legitimacy and sexual enjoyment/ availability.[171] This division, however, is too strict and does not convey the actual multiplicity of prostitutes' status and

[167] Cohen (2015: 30) has an interesting view on Solon's sanction of brothels, stating that it was "a democratic reform".
[168] Davidson, 1998: 112-126. Glazebrook, 2016: 704.
[169] Pomeroy, 1975: 89.
[170] See, for example, the *pallake* of Philomenos, in Antiphon 1.14-20.
[171] Glazebrook (2006: 128) argues that the image of the *hetaira* in judicial oratory is constructed in opposition to the image of the ideal wife, *sophron gunê*, showing how the orators depict *hetairai* as someone who "provides sex to anyone who can pay, is excessive in her behaviour, and often arrogant and impious". She bases part of her argument on the work of Helen North (1977, 36-38), who previously argued that Penelope and Andromache are the models of the ideal wife in classical literature.

functionalities.[172] For example, Draco's law includes "concubines (παλλακή) kept for the procreation of legitimate children" (Dem. 23.53). The law clearly separates "respectable women" from prostitutes that are not mentioned but makes no distinction between wives and *pallakai*. In a similar manner, high-rated *hetairai* share more in common with married women than with street prostitutes.

As Glazebrook (2016: 708.709) states, in ancient Greece, a girl that prostitutes herself loses her personal identity, becoming simply a *porne*, *hetaira*, *pallake* or *paidiske.*[173] They assume the character of the "other", the women that do not regulate their behaviour by the social standards of women deemed respectable. The separation between the respectable and the "other" women is even perceptible in the physical boundaries of the city. As we have seen, it was expected for women to stay at home, as much as possible, protecting themselves from exposure to the outsider's gaze. Their reputation is defended by the walls of the house. Lower status prostitutes obeyed the opposite guideline. They spent their days outside the house, making themselves available to the eyes of the men, advertising their services.[174] Davidson (1997: 130) finds an interesting parallel between the general accessibility to the brothel/ street prostitute, where the sexual transaction is easy, quick and cheap, and their openness and availability to male's eyes.[175]

[172] Glazebrook (2016: 706) Neaira, for example, is called both *hetaira* and *porne*. For a reading of Neaira and the depiction of a prostitute see Glazebrook, 2005. For a discussion of this binomialism see Cohen, 2006. For a discussion on the construction of the image of the *hetaira* in ancient Athens see Glazebrook, 2006.

[173] Glazebrook argues this aspect in contrast to what happens with male prostitutes. "Whereas males might engage in prostitution (Lysias 3), women who did the same took on the identity of prostitute. So, while verbs of prostitution more commonly indicate a male's profession in ancient Athens (i.e., "he prostituted himself"), she is a *hetaira*, *pallake*, *paidiske*, or *porne*, suggesting it is more than an activity for making a living – it is her identity. The distinction in terminology for male and female prostitutes at Athens reinforces the attitude that women are prostitutes by nature and that being a prostitute is more than simply a way to make a living. The ancients, at least in the case of women, did not view prostitution as a trade, like today, but treated it as an identity."

[174] Davidson (1997, 78) shows how some of the names used to define street prostitutes convey the idea of homelessness: "bridge woman" (*gephuris*), "runner" (*dromas*), "wanderer" (*peripolas*), "alley-treader" (*spodesilaura*). Xenophon *Mem.* 2.2.4 defines them as a means to release the pressure of lust.

[175] He goes further and analyses a difference between this sort of sexual worker and famous, high-priced *hetairai*, that, similarly to wives, would be protected by walls and not available to everyone's gaze.

This separation between the women and the "others" is also perceptible in the feminine clothing and toilette. The respectable women would commonly wear clothes that concealed their body from the male gaze, made of wool or linen,[176] and a veil. Prostitutes, on the other hand, would use clothes which were much more transparent, with vibrant colours such as saffron.[177] In Syracuse, there was a law forbidding a woman from wearing gold ornaments or vivid coloured dresses unless she willingly admitted being a prostitute (Davison, 1997: 73).[178] However, this might have only applied to street *pornai*, that needed to attract possible clients, and not to famous *hetairai*. Athenaeus, active in the second-third century C.E.[179] (13.590ff.) tells us that Phryne was an extremely attractive woman, however it was almost impossible to catch a glimpse of her body. She always used a tunic that covered her entirely and never took part in public baths, except during the Poseidonia, where supposedly she entered the sea without her cloak.[180] In his text, Athenaeus also relates the famous episode of the exposure of Phryne. Supposedly, she was charged with impiety, and chose Hyperides, one of her lovers, to defend her. However, the orator's arguments did not compel the judges to acquit Phryne who, facing the possibility of being punished, ripped her clothes, exposing her naked breasts, "and inspired the judges with a superstitious fear, so that they were so moved by pity as not to be able to stand the idea of condemning to death "a prophetess and priestess of Aphrodite".[181] The exposure of Phryne causes a great impact on the judges because of the

[176] Pomeroy, 1975: 83.
[177] Davidson (1997: 133) alludes to the public behaviour of grand *hetairai* as a comparative point to married women. They would also present themselves in public fully dressed, hiding their body from public view. There was, however, a different purpose for this dressing: "maintain the market-value".
[178] Eye makeup was also identified with prostitutes. See Glazebrook, Mellor, 2013: 42.
[179] For the relevance of Athenaeus regarding the discussion of ancient Greek societies, please see pp.203-204.
[180] Davidson (1997: 134) briefly explores this episode, stating that Phryne got into the sea not completely naked, keeping her tunic on. In his own words "the sight might have been more like a wet T-shirt contest than Botticelli's nude. Phryne does not keep herself entirely from view, nor does she expose herself completely. Complete invisibility and complete exposure arrest movement along the continuum, and thereby neutralize desire. By revealing a lot, but keeping her clothes on, Phryne keeps herself within that economy and arouses longing for what is hidden".
[181] Tr. Gulick. According to Athenaeus, this is the reason why, from that point on, no man or woman could be present in court during their case.

singularity of the moment. Although most likely being a fictional story, the impact of the disrobing is telling of the value of female clothing in ancient Greece. As Davidson (1997: 134) puts it, "If she had made herself more available Phryne could not have expected to produce such an impact, but thanks to years of glimpses and rumours and guessing, her sudden exposure must have had an effect rather like the dénouement at the end of a complicated plot". By showing what was not supposed to be seen, the social boundaries that separated men and women faded, and the final fulfilment of the growing desire in those men (the desire to see the body that was always completely hidden by its garments, according to social regulations), was powerful enough to compel a favourable verdict.

In terms of sexual visual transgression, the social boundaries that regulate the contact between men and women are generally void when approaching the world of prostitution. Street prostitutes needed to show their bodies to attract potential clientele, and such behaviour nullifies the transgressive aspect of gazing on a woman. There is no sexual transgression when gazing on the body is the norm and the expected behaviour. Although the distinction between *pornai* and *hetairai* is not always clear,[182] the sources tend to show that at least high-status courtesans[183] would convey a public image like the one of the legitimate wife, dressing in clothes that covered their entire body and wearing the veil. This apparent adoption of social rules might be due to more than just the personal interest in showing herself as a respectable woman, but also to inflame anyone who saw her with a desire to behold what is not available for everyone. Independently of this public image, they were still recognized as women who could be bought, and so the transgression in looking is not applicable. They do not belong to a household, are not under the power of a father or husband, and so cannot inflict serious damage to the family's honour. Despite trying to show themselves as respectable women, society does not see them as

[182] Plutarch (*Solon* 15.3), for example, states that *pornai* and *hetairai* are the same.
[183] However, these high-rated prostitutes, such as Phryne (Athenaeus 13.590e – 591f; Paus. 10.15.1) and Rhodopis (Hdt. 2.135), were certainly a minority and most likely will have started their career from the bottom.

such. Phryne's trial is a good example of this. Facing the naked body of a beautiful women, the judges are not coyed by the sight but indeed feel compelled to acquit her. If we change this account, and instead of a courtesan exposing her body we have the wife of a citizen, the situation, the verdict and the judges' behaviour would most likely be much different.

1.7. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have explored the ancient Greek perception of vision and looking, what could be seen and what could not; how you should look and at what, in various specific situations. If we return to the beginning, the claim of voyeurism in ancient Greece in modern scholarship, I made it clear that we cannot speak of voyeurism in this context without a proper definition of the term. Today, voyeurism implies a general idea of looking at someone with a sexual situation, however there are several different nuances that make it impossible to apply the term uniformly, without explaining which version of voyeurism we are referring to. My starting point was the *DSM-V* definition for voyeuristic disorder, which is impossible to completely transfer to the study of the ancient world. We do not have enough information to validate the possibility that something like a voyeuristic activity was considered a mental disorder. The notion of 'mental disorder' itself, as we have it, would not be the same in ancient Greek society. What this initial analysis of the usage of the term in modern scholarship showed, is that voyeurism is a common word in today's English lexicon to refer to any situation where someone secretly watches another in a sexual situation. It is not the perfect solution to express the episodes and situations that are usually referred to as voyeurism in ancient Greece, but rather a linguistic cane that helps to support the phrasing of a specific idea that lacks a more suited term. That gap is better filled with the conception of 'Sexual Visual Transgression' that I

explored in the current chapter, although I do grant that 'voyeurism', as a more succinct expression, sounds better.

However, despite the modern paraphiliac definition of voyeurism not being applicable to the ancient world, this does not mean that several traits of the specific action today recognized as voyeurism are not observable in ancient Greece. The information conveyed by the sources shows that the ancient Greeks were aware that there were visual actions that could transgress social boundaries. All the specific examples of sexual visual transgression that were covered in this chapter share a common trait: the punishment of the perpetrator, especially when the looker is of a low social status and the person observed is of a higher social status. Actaeon and Pentheus are dismembered, Tiresias is blinded, Candaules is murdered and Gyges' bloodline is prophesized not to last further than the fifth generation. The argument of a man invading another man's *oikos* and gazing upon the women that are meant to be shielded from the male eyes, was supposed to compel the opinion of a judge. Despite the differences in social status, limitations, control, levels of privacy and seclusion that existed between people from different socio-economic backgrounds, there was a shared culture that tried to prevent visual contact between men and women. Such preoccupation most likely rose from a conception of love, desire and seduction associated with looking, and especially with mutual eye contact, that was deeply rooted in ancient Greece. Women should be shielded from the masculine gaze, either by the walls of the house, the thickness of their garments, or just the social conception that separated the two genders. For a man to gaze on a free woman, other than his own wife, in a private situation would completely defy the socially accepted behaviour of the time, and the sources imply that this could indeed incur punishment. These boundaries would be overlooked when the person being gazed on was of low social status, not protected by family bonds, or a slave. Some classes of prostitutes would not be considered under the same social boundaries as women under a *kurios*. Indeed, to them, exposure to the male gaze was a constant, both metaphorically, since they were exposed

to any man that could afford their low fee; and physically, since depicting their naked body would be a way to attract potential clients.

It is not possible to write about voyeurism in ancient Greece, because, rigorously speaking, it did not exist. At least, not with all the different perspectives that we today theorize for voyeurism. But we can trace the basis of the voyeuristic action, the sexual visual transgression. In other words, the paraphiliac behaviour did not exist in ancient Greece, but there was indeed a para-philia based on the act of looking at what was not meant to be seen. There was a deeply rooted connection between eyes, erotism and sexual desire. Such a sexualized gaze was opposed by the social boundaries erected between the eyes and their object. Not only purely mythical accounts but also narratives claiming historicity show that whoever transgresses those visual barriers always suffers a harsh punishment. There is a rape analogy in this action: a sexual intention, perpetrated through the eyes without the other person's consent. I will further explore the matter of consent, and ability to consent in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 2

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter I explore the concept of sexual abuse of children in ancient Greece, exploring the reasons why it was considered a sexual transgression. I start by discussing the Greek terminology for children, and specifically the term *pais/ paides* (παῖς/ παῖδες) that is commonly used to define children of either gender, as well as slaves. I afterwards approach another terminology question, specifically the usage of the verbs *paidophileō* (παιδοφιλέω) and *paidophthoreō* (παιδοφθορέω), and the adjective *paidophilos* (παιδόφιλος), separating their ancient significance from today's use of the derivate word, paedophilia (or pedophilic disorder, as included in the *DSM*). These sections are necessary to better understand the second part of the chapter, where the sexual use of children in ancient Greece is discussed in detail. It is crucial to start by properly defining the terminology and discuss the application of modern terms that are commonly and anachronistically applied to the popular knowledge of ancient Greece.

When discussing sexual abuse of children, we first need to explore the connection between sex and children, and specifically their first sexual encounter. In ancient Greece,[184] children, both boys and girls, would be considered ready to initiate their sex lives at quite an early age, usually marked by the first signs of puberty.[185] Since it was

[184] As in so many other cases in the study of antiquity, a great amount of the sources that we have available are from Athens. Among the Athenian sources, we have texts which provide information concerning Crete and Sparta, among others, that should nevertheless be approached with care. I make a couple of references to Herodotus, that in general convey realities from other societies. In section 2.6 I also explore the laws of the city of Beroea.

[185] See 2.4.

expected of them to play a sexual role within society from that age (matters of consent would vary according to the gender and social position of the child, as I discuss in this chapter), I decided to focus on *paides* under this 'sex age', whom I usually refer to in this chapter as 'immature' or 'prepubescent' *paides*. I explore the problematics of age in antiquity, the age of sexuality of boys, girls and slaves, so I can then analyse the information that survived concerning sexual targeting of prepubescent children. The inclusion of slaves in this study, following the sociological approach already applied in the previous chapter, is necessary for two main reasons: first, some of the terms used to refer to children (specifically the term *pais*) could also be used to refer to slaves, therefore there is a connection between being a child and being a slave that needs to be explored. Second, my intention in this chapter is to explore the sexual abuse of children, independently of gender or social status.

It will be noted that the sections where I approach male children are considerably longer than the others. The reason is that we have much more information for boys than for girls and slaves. Pederastic poems, such as the ones from Theognis, artistic representations and discussion in philosophical treatises provides us with testimonies of the idealization of a boy's beauty and the sexual value that male *paides* could have among adult men. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the importance that the sources which are usually approached in the study of pederasty have for the topic that I am exploring, this is not a study of pederasty. The reason is that pederasty was in general a socially accepted and legally sanctioned practice, in no way the same as the sexual abuse of male children, a sexual behaviour that exceeds the boundaries of accepted sexual contact with children. This is a notion that we get from several different ancient sources: there were established social (and potentially legal) limits that regulated the sexual contact between adults and children, and I explore these sources in the following sections. Although this is not a study on pederasty, I do, nonetheless, use expressions that are traditionally linked with pederastic practices, such as *erastēs* (ἐραστής) and *erōmenos* (ἐρώμενος), especially

when discussing the age of sexual maturation of boys. Besides the cultural importance of pederasty, and the number of sources that discuss man-boy love, this wide difference in the number of sources that approach boy sexuality from the number of sources that approach young female sexuality, might partially be because girls would enjoy a different level of protection and overall lack of freedom than boys, and so boys would be exposed to more dangers. We have some evidence reporting the martial rape of prepubescent girls, however I chose in general to consider these events under the category of slave's sex.[186] I then analyse the legal evidence in order to ascertain whether sexual abuse of children was a legally punished practice. Finally, I offer an analysis of the psychological consequences that abused children might have suffered.

There are some references to 'paedophilia' in classical scholarship, although none from a deeply researched study on the subject. Unlike the case of voyeurism, however, the term is far less applied and with far more caution. In the introduction to their edited volume, Verstraete and Provencal (2005: 3-4) found it necessary to highlight that "pederasty was not perceived by the Greeks to involve prepubescent sexual relations". In Provencal's contribution to the volume, he further specified this initial predicament by stating that "Pederasty (both ancient and modern) should not be confused with our meaning of pedophilia to designate the sexual exploitation – whether heterosexual or homosexual – of a child's immaturity". Although the authors' aim in their papers is not to explore paedophilia in ancient Greece, nor the dichotomies between paedophilia and pederasty, these remarks highlight how careful we should be when addressing these subjects, a statement that I uphold throughout this chapter.

[186] Kathy Gaca has written extensively on this topic in the last few years. As she (2012: 98) puts it, "one of the purposes of andrapodizing or populace-ravaging warfare was to make civil law its first causality and thereby create a seemingly anarchic but martially regulated license to take young female captives". When a city is conquered, their once freeborn children lose their rights, the previous laws of the city are no longer upheld, and so their status is downgraded to the position of slaves by the conquering power. I would like to express my gratitude to Kathy Gaca, for providing me with access to several of her articles.

James Davidson (2007) names one of his subchapters "The paedophile myth". Here, Davidson argues that sex between young boys and old men is a key part of Greek Love,[187] confronting the general idea of Greeks as paedophiles. Davidson stipulates that boys could be courted at eighteen years old, basing his argument on the notion that in ancient times, puberty would start five years later than today. Like many other scholars,[188] I do not support Davidson's proposals, especially his arguments concerning the age from which a child could be courted, since it is not possible to reconcile this argument with the information conveyed by the ancient sources. The only sources that make a specific reference to the lower age of the *erōmenos* agree that twelve years old was the lower limit. Other sources that approach pederasty generally make a reference to boys that already show the development of secondary sexual characteristics, such as the first signs of beard, while it is clear that there is a considerable separation in time between this age and the age of adulthood, around eighteen, that would most likely be the common upper age limit of an *erōmenos*, and not the lower limit as Davidson argues.

In his 2010 paper, Christian Laes differentiates pederasty from the modern meaning of paedophilia and discusses the sexual value of children in antiquity. He denies that there was something like a law of consent in ancient Greece but denounces the modern perception of the paedophile as a monster, arguing that it is a twentieth-century construction. Laes is, in no way, making a eulogy of modern paedophilia, but nevertheless he considers it important to take the ancient notion of child sexuality into consideration when discussing today's laws of consent. In his own words (2010: 53), "At least, they [classicists and ancient historians] should point to the relativity of the predominating concept of chronological age of consent (as if one could see from a nude boy's body

[187] As Davidson (2007: 68) puts it: "Of all the many misconceptions about Greek Love, perhaps the most unwarranted is the idea that it was essentially 'paedophile' in character, that its key feature was sex between 'old men' and 'young boys'".

[188] See for example, Golden (1990: 58-62), Fisher (2001: 38), Cantarella (2002: 36-44), Verstraete (2009), Hubbard (2009) Laes (2010: 46) and Lear (2014: 120-121).

whether he is actually sixteen or eighteen years old), they should explain how people in Antiquity admitted the fact of being attracted to teenagers (instead of simply repressing this feeling, they tried to cope with the difficulties which were involved in it), they should say that even in relationships which are not 'equal', power and consent can be negotiable." One of the fundamental points of Laes' paper is that modern paedophilia does not correspond to the ancient concept of pederasty, as I have already indicated in this introduction. There is a clear distance between the sexual mores of ancient Greeks and today's western societies, therefore approaching an ancient sexual relationship through modern concepts and sets of morals will eventually result in anachronistic readings of the ancient sources.

The use of the term 'paedophilia' in classical scholarship, without supplying the reader with a definition of the term, might motivate some confusion on its actual meaning. Paedophilia, in today's Western societies, is generally understood as unlawful sexual contact between an adult (branded as a paedophile) and a child (boys and girls under a certain age of consent). Paedophilia, as I showed in the case of voyeurism, can be either pathological or criminal, depending on the criteria applied. In the *DSM-V* it is listed as 'pedophilic disorder', and the main diagnosis line is a "recurrent, intense sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviors involving sexual activity with a prepubescent child or children (generally age 13 years or younger)". According to the UK penal code, thirteen is also established as the age limit, since the rape or assault of a child under that age is punished with imprisonment for life, however, a sexual relationship between an eighteen-year-old person, or older and a person under sixteen falls under the spectrum of *Child Sexual Offences*, and is punishable with imprisonment not exceeding fourteen years.

As becomes clear in the following sections, we cannot address sexual contact between children and adults in ancient Greece through a modern paraphiliac concept, because paedophilia did not exist as we conceive it today. As I show in the following

sections, there was accepted sexual contact between certain children and adults, considering the child's state of maturation, gender and social status, that would be considered paedophilia in today's world. Therefore, in ancient Greece there was adult-child sexual contact that was accepted, and adult-child sexual contact that transgressed the accepted boundaries, which was therefore a para-philia. Considering the range of meanings that the term 'paedophilia' carries in our modern lexicon, and its contrast with the actual meaning of the term in ancient Greece, as it will become clear in section 2.2, instead of using 'paedophilia' in the study of antiquity, for the sake of clarity and accuracy I use the expression 'child sexual abuse', which should be understood as a transgressive sexual contact with children. Who exactly was considered a child in ancient Greece, and the specific terminology used to refer to children is explored in the following section.

2.2. Terminology

2.2.3. *Pais*/*paides*

There is more than one term for children in ancient Greek, however the most common words are *pais* and *teknon*. Although both terms are used to refer to children, they are not exact synonyms, since they do not refer to the same age group: *pais* usually refers to older children or young, adolescents, while *teknon* refers to children in the earlier stages of life,[189] a meaning that *pais* usually does not carry, unless when combined with an adjective that emphasises the child's youth.[190] *Teknon*, and terms that derive from *teknon*, are commonly used to refer to children that are still in their earlier years; or to express the idea of son or daughter. However, contrary to *pais*, it is not commonly used

[189] For a good, short approach to this discussion, see Golden, 1985; 2015: 10.

[190] For example, when mentioning the new-born Odysseus (*Od.* 19.400), Homer uses *paida neon gegaōta*. When mentioning younger children, Solon (fr. 27.1-2) uses the expression *paides anēbos*, children still in the process of losing their baby teeth.

to make a reference to older children.[191] In the *Iliad* (1.362; 413), Thetis addresses Achilles as *teknon*. Agamemnon (2.136) also refers to the small children, *tekna*, sons and daughters of the Achaean men that are waiting, alongside their wives, for the return of their fathers. Dione (*Il.* 382) refers to Aphrodite as *teknon emon*. Herodotus uses the term several times, usually to refer to someone's son or daughter.[192]

In Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* (889) Myrrhine refers to her child as *teknidion*, a little baby. Thetis addresses Achilles saying that she is the one of brought him into the world (τεκοῦσα).[193] Herodotus (5.40) refers to women bearing children as *teknopoios* and Aristotle (*Pol*. 1253b) expresses the same meaning through *teknopoiētikos* . Xenophon (*Mem.* 2.2.4) uses the verb *teknopoieō* of women giving birth. *Teknon* is then clearly linked to the idea of childbirth and the earliest years of a person's life, and never actually used in texts that cover aspects of children's sexuality, which is the focus of this chapter. They do, however, share the notion of one's progeny. Homer (*Il*. 2.205) refers to Zeus as Kronos' *pais*; to Agapenor (2.610) as the son of Ancaeus, and, at the beginning of the poem (1.20), Chryses begs Agamemnon and Menelaus to return his *paida*, Chryseis, to him.

Pais is commonly used to refer to a boy, possibly from six-seven[194] until seventeen-eighteen, the time when one generally becomes a man. In one of the few references that we have to the specific age of boys, specifically boys of sexually interest, Strato (*AP*.12.4) does speaks of *paides*:

Ἀκμῇ δωδεκέτους ἐπιτέρπομαι· ἔστι δὲ τούτου

[191] They are, nevertheless, sometimes used together. In Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers*, Clytemnestra begs her son, Orestes, to not kill her like he did with her lover Aegisthus, by calling him both *pai* and *teknon*, trying to make her son remember that she was the one who nourished him from her own breast. Herodotus uses both *paidion* and *teknon* (5.51) to refer to Gorgo, Cleomenes' only daughter. Golden (2015: 10) gives several examples of this two-term usage.

[192] See, for example; 1.30; 1.61; 1.164; 1.196; 2.30; 2.66; 2.120; 2.129; 3.1.

[193] ὤ μοι τέκνον ἐμόν, τί νύ σ᾽ ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ τεκοῦσα.

[194] Aristophanes of Byzantium (41) says that *pais* is the boy at the age where he starts to attend school (six or seven years old).

χὠ τρισκαιδεκέτης πουλὺ ποθεινότερος·
χὠ τὰ δὶς ἑπτὰ νέμων, γλυκερώτερον ἄνθος Ἐρώτων·
τερπνότερος δ᾽ ὁ τρίτης πεντάδος ἀρχόμενος·
ἐξεπικαιδέκατον δὲ θεῶν ἔτος· ἑβδόματον δὲ
καὶ δέκατον ζητεῖν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός.
εἰ δ᾽ ἐπὶ πρεσβυτέρους τις ἔχει πόθον, οὐκέτι παίζει,
ἀλλ᾽ ἤδη ζητεῖ "τὸν δ᾽ ἀπαμειβόμενος."

I delight in the prime of a boy of twelve,
but one of thirteen is much more desirable.
He who is fourteen is a still sweeter flower of the Loves,
and one who is just beginning his fifteenth year is yet more delightful.
The sixteenth year is that of the gods,
and as for the seventeenth it is not for me, but for Zeus, to seek it.
But if one has a desire for those still older, he no longer plays,
but now seeks "And answering him back."[195]

Although Strato is a later source than the ones previously considered in this section, the information he provides is relevant to the discussion of sexual bounds between adults and children in classical times. Although being a poetic source, that should be used with considerable caution, in my opinion, it provides important information for the study of the sexual dynamics between adults and boys in ancient Greece. As Cantarella (2002: 37) articulated, the *Greek Anthology* "not only demonstrates – without the shadow of a doubt – the continuity and vitality of pederotic poetry, but provides valuable information on the social rules governing this type of love, which included, in pride of place, the question of the suitable age".[196] When discussing the validity of Strato's epigrams, the considerations on the age of *paides* and specifically of *paides* who could be lawfully courted by men, we should keep in mind that the information conveyed in Strato's epigrams is in line with the only other surviving reference to the specific age of *paides* in a sexual context (Plut. *Lyc*. 17), while also matching the information on physical maturation of boys conveyed by authors such as Plato and Xenophon.

[195] Tr. Paton. Although Strato does not use *pais* in this epigram, it is clearly implied by the usage in the previous epigrams, specifically the first and third, and the title of his work is *Mousa paidikē.*

[196] Laes (2010: 40-41) also recognizes the value of these epigrams for the study of archaic and classical pederasty, specifically highlighting the links that exist between the pederastic epigrams of the *Anthologia Palatina* and, for example, the poetry of Theognis.

Pais might also be used to refer to girls. This is particularly clear, as Kathy Gaca (2012, 2014) as shown, in sources that use the tripartite formula *gynaikes*, *paides* and *parthenoi*, usually referring to sexually developed women, prepubescent girls, children and maidens on the verge of puberty, respectively. A paradigmatic example of the usage of *pais* to mean female children is found in the writings of Marcellinus, the second century C.E. medical writer. In his treaty *On the Pulse* (Περὶ σφυγμῶν), otherwise known as *De Pulsibus*, the author refers the sensations that female patients go through when a male doctor enters their room. He says that girls (παῖδας), maidens (παρθένοι) and women (γυναῖκας) feel both a sense of shame (αἰδώς) and fear (ἔκπληξις) because they are not used to be looked at, neither to have their private affairs taken away.[197]

Pais can also mean a slave of any age.[198] As Golden (1985: 98-100) showed, it is possible that the correlation between child and slave in the meaning of *pais* was made because children and slaves were sometimes expected to fulfil similar social roles. In Herodotus (6.137.3), for example, it is said that before having slaves, it was children who were in charge of getting water from the fountain. For Plato (*Rep.* 4. 431c) children and slaves share some common traces such as moral weakness and a greater susceptibility to pain and pleasure. The first known usage of the term to refer to a slave is found in Aeschylus (*Cho.* 653), when Orestes is knocking on the palace door, while pretending to be a stranger. There are also examples in comedy and oratory: in Aristophanes' *Archanians* (395), Dicaeopolis summons Euripides' slave by calling him *pais.*[199] In *Against Apatourius* (33.8), Demosthenes uses *pais* to refer to the slave crew of a ship. Although when referring to slaves, the age range of the term is much wider than when

[197] *De pulsibus*, 130-138. For this passage see Gaca (2014: 317). For a discussion of this medical treaty see Lewis (2015). When translating the same passage as Gaca, Lewis (p.205) choses to translate *paidas* as "children". In my opinion, Gaca's translation of *paidas* as "girls" is more accurate. Not only did she provide compelling evidence for the feminine meaning of *paidas* when inserted in the tripartite expression *paidas, parthenoi* and *gunaikes*, but also Marcellinus' report of the patient reaction implies that we are speaking of females. There is no reason that explains why male children would not be used to being looked at.

[198] Golden, 1985: 91.

[199] More specifically *pai*, since Aristophanes used the vocative form of *pais*.

referring to freeborn children, it is sometimes possible to discern whether the authors are mentioning a child or an adult slave.

There are other terms, sharing the same common root although less used then *pais*, that are used to express boy, girl or even slave. *Paidiskē* is used to refer to a young girl, possible near a marriable age, or female slave. Xenophon (*Ana*. 4.3.11) conveys the tale of two young soldiers who came across an old man, his wife and some *paidiskas*.[200] In Lysias (1.12), Euphiletus' wife accuses him of having sexual interest in the young maid (παιδίσκην). In another speech, Lysias (13.65) relates that one of Agoratus's brothers was caught while trying to kidnap a young girl (παιδίσκην) and was sentenced to death. In Hyperides' *Against Athenogenes* (3.1) there is a reference to a *paidiskē* who was bought for three hundred drachmas. In *Archanians* (1448), the chorus makes a reference to a young beautiful girl (παιδίσκης ὡραιοτάτης) with whom Dicaeopolis would eventually have intercourse. Isaeus (8.35) also uses *paidiskē* to refer to a young girl, although in another speech (6.19) he refers to prostitutes as *paidiskai*. This is another possible meaning for the word, also found in Herodotus (1.93). Dinarchus (1.23) mentions the case of Olynthian *paidiskē* that a certain Euthymachus unlawfully put in a brothel. Apollodorus (Dem.59.18–20) tells us that Nikaretê acquired several of her prostitutes (παιδίσκας) while they were very young children (μικρῶν παιδίων).

Another term deriving from *pais* that is commonly used is *paidion*. Aristophanes of Byzantium (38), in his treaty *Peri onomasias ēlikiōn*, states that *paidion* is still a breastfeeding child. Herodotus uses *paidion* to refer to the new born baby Cyrus multiple times.[201] In *Peace* (112), Aristophanes uses the vocative form *paidi* to refer to the little

[200] Xenophon (*Const. Lac.* 3.5) also uses the male form, *paidiskos*, to refer to young boys.

[201] See, among other instances, 1.109.1; 1.110.3; 1.11.1-3; 1.112.1; 1.113.2-3. However, when Astyages refers to Cyrus, he usually refers to his daughter, Madane, and ???son, using the term *pais* instead of *paidion*. See 1.108.2 and 1.117.3-5. Herodotus uses *paidion* several times in his books, either to express new born children or at least very young children. See also, among other instances, 2.2.2; 2.2.3; 2.15.2; 2.119.2; 3.12.2; 5.51.1.

girls of Trygaeus.[202] When debating the accusation's speech, Theopompus (Isae. 11.37) uses both *paidion*[203] and *pais* to refer to his nephew. In another speech (4.10), *paidion* is used to refer to the son of Chariades and his hetaira. In Lysias (1.6), Euphiletus uses *paidion* to refer to his new born child,[204] and in *Against Simon* (3.33), the speaker uses *paidion* to refer to Theodotus, the boy he loved.[205] Demosthenes (19.194) refers to the daughters of Apollophanes of Pydna that were very young children when their father was assassinated.[206] In a rarer use of the word, Aristophanes (*Ra.* 37) refers to young slaves as *paidion*. [207] This exploration of the use of *pais*, and the words that derived from this root, in ancient Greek sources shows that is was commonly used to address children of different ages, states of maturation and different social status. As we move into the following sections, I discuss several different sources where these terms are applied to address specifically prepubescent children. Before moving to these sources, it is relevant to expand this initial analysis of terminology and discuss three other terms that share the same *pais* root, namely *paidophileō, paidophilos* and *paidophthoreō*. It is relevant to discuss this at this point, since these terms are similar to our modern 'paedophilia', which is the only instance among the sexual activities that I explore here when a modern term shares clear morphological similarities with an ancient one. Voyeurism, bestiality/zoophilia or necrophilia are not similar terms to the ones used in ancient Greek to refer to sexual visual transgression, human-animal sex or sex with corpses. Therefore, it is important that I address the use of these terms, and properly explain the differences between modern and ancient meanings.

[202] He also uses the term in other instances (50; 1268). In 1295 he uses *paidion* to refer to the son of Cleomenes.
[203] See also 2.6; 3.69.
[204] See also 13.42.
[205] He does however use the diminutive only in this instance, possible expecting to obtain a more compelling result by expressing how vulnerable he was, only accompanied by this small child, in opposition to Simon.
[206] See also 19.281; 283 and 310.
[207] See also *Nu.* 132, *Av.* 1150.

2.2.2. *Paidophileō, paidophilos* and *paidophthoreō*

The term paedophilia shares clear similarities with the ancient Greek verb *paidophileō*, "to love children", and the correlated adjective *paidophilos*, "loving children". However, their meanings are very different. We find these Greek words being used in ancient inscriptions and seventh-to-sixth-century elegiac poetry, where the topic of love between boys and adult men was a very important theme, and where the negative connotation that the word "paedophile" carries in the 21st century is not perceptible. In an inscription found in Phaistos, Crete, dated around the year 700 B.C.E. there is a reference to a man named Paidophila (Lover of boys), which might point to the existence and acceptance of sexual relationships between men and boys.[208] In a fragment of Solon (25), the term *paidophilēsē* is also used:

> σθ᾽ ἥβης ἐρατοῖσιν ἐπ᾽ ἄνθεσι παιδοφιλήσῃ,
> μηρῶν ἱμείρων καὶ γλυκεροῦ στόματος.
>
> till in the flower of youth he loves a boy
> with the desire of things and sweet lips;[209]

Plutarch quotes these lines in his *Amatorius* (5), naming Solon as a good example of the "erotic man" (ἐρωτικοῦ ἄνδρος), making no further judgement on the sexual attraction of Solon towards a young man. There is no negative moral judgement of the boy-lover, although in this case the poem is attributed to the *paidophilos* himself.

In the amatory poems traditionally attributed to Theognis,[210] the 6th century elegiac poet from Megara, the term is used several times.[211] When cursing his former

[208] Fisher, 2001: 28.

[209] Tr. Edmunds slighted adapted.

[210] For the *Theognidea*, see West, 1974: 40-71 and Lear, 2011: 378-93.

[211] I am providing examples from the *Theognidea* since it is one of the largest surviving sources of pederastic poetry, although we do know that much more poetry should have existed. Alcaeus is supposed to be one of the most prolific pederastic poets, however we barely know anything that he wrote. For this see Lear, 2014: 104.

beloved for leaving him, the poet says, "I would no one whatsoever who shall see you may be willing to set his love on you" (σὲ δὲ μήτις ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσορῶν παιδοφιλεῖν ἐθέλοι) (1318). After this initial broken heart rampage, the author shows that he still is infatuated with the young boy, stating his desire to have the boy's love (Παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν) (1345), and that on the neck of the child-lover there is an eternal mark of love (αἰεὶ παιδοφίλῃσιν ἐπὶ ζυγὸν αὐχένι κεῖται δύσλοφον, ἀργαλέον μνῆμα φιλοξενίης) (1357-58). The relevance of boy-man love is a constant topic in the *Theognidea,* being portrayed as superior to the love between a man and a woman, since the bond between man and boy is based on mutual trust, contrary to the relationship with a woman (1367-68).[212]

In all the examples, it is demonstrated how the term could be applied with its literal meaning without a negative connotation.[213] This seems to change with the advent of Christianity and in later Judaic sources, where we find a new term being coined, *paidophthoreō,* that carries a closer meaning of our modern conception of paedophilia. The term derivates from *pais* plus the term *phthor*, that can either derive from *phthora*, meaning 'destruction' or *phthoreus*, meaning 'corrupter' or 'seducer'. Independently of the nuance of the meaning, it certainly expresses a sense of destruction of children, contraposing to the notion of love of children that *paidophilos* and *paiderastia,* for example, convey.[214] It appears several times in the third and fifth books of the *Sibylline oracles,* considered to have been written somewhere in the 1st – 2nd centuries B.C.E., by one or various Hellenistic Jewish authors.[215] It became a widely popular word to attack

[212] For more on this dichotomy, see Nicholson, 2000.

[213] We find it being used, in a much later source, still conveying a positive impression. In the Orphic poem dedicated to Demeter (Orph. *H.* 40.13) she is called *paidophilē,* an epithet that invokes her love for children.

[214] Martens (2009: 252-253) is, to my knowledge, the most complete approach to the usage of *paidophthoreō*. Concerning the translation of the term, he states: "What then is the best translation of the word *paidophthoreo*? Is it to corrupt, to seduce or to destroy? Or is it some combination of these? It is difficult to decide among these possible translations, since some aspects of each are needed to accurately portray the nuances of the word.

[215] For a commentary on the third book see Buitenwerf, 2003.

the Greco-Roman tradition of love between men and child in Christian sources, from the second century C.E. to late antiquity. It is used in the *Didache* (2.2) and in the *Epistle of Barnabas* (19.4). Clement of Alexandria uses it in the *Protrepticus* (10.108.5), as well as Origen in the third century.[216] The word is commonly used to express the prohibition of having sex with children, a part of the Christian discourse against Greco-Roman religion and practices.

The meaning of paedophilia today is, therefore, very far away from the significance of *paidophileō*. Ancient Greek use of *paidophileō* reflects the love for a boy that was necessary for a pederastic relationship. We can say that, for the Greeks, 'paedophilia' was required for pederasty, although pederasty does not correspond to our modern sense of paedophilia. Therefore, a Greek could lawfully be a *paidophilos*, however, our modern sense of paedophilia (closer to the meaning of *paidophthoreō*) would not be accepted in ancient Greece, as I show in the following sections.

2.3. 'Age' of sexuality

In this section I discuss the age at which a young person would be able to engage in a sexual relationship with an adult, so it becomes possible to separate the children that were mature enough to consent and to engage in a possibly sexual relationship with an older man, from the ones that were not mature enough.[217] Those *paides*, that for the sake

[216] For more references see Martens, 2009.

[217] This problem is still perceptible in modern societies. The legal age of consent varies greatly from country to country. Even if we focus on Europe and North America, this dichotomy is quite visible. A study by Graupner (2000) on sexual consent laws showed that, to the date of the article, some countries such as Cyprus, Romania, Lithuania and Finland do not have a specific minimum age limit, and other countries like Spain and Malta set a minimum age limit of twelve years old, others such as Croatia and Portugal at fourteen. Although several modifications to these countries' legislation have been made in the last eighteen years, it still serves to see how the problem of setting minimum age for lawful sexual contact, and to balance age and personal maturation, is complicated in modern times. Most recently, this discussion reemerged in France, due to two cases of sexual intercourse between adults and eleven-year-old girls who were acquitted

of clarification I will call 'prepubescent *paides*', are the most important case subject for this chapter. Following on the previous section I start by exploring the ages when children, male, female and slaves, were socially and legally able to engage in relationships of a sexual nature, this way separating those two classes of *paides*: the ones that could be courted from the ones that were too young to be courted.

Age in ancient Greece is generally a complicated subject to address. For a start, ancient Greeks did not have same interest in age and celebration of anniversaries like we do in modern western societies. Furthermore, it becomes especially complicate to discuss age when we consider the amount of vocabulary that was used to define age gaps, definitions that might vary considering the geography of Greece: *paides* might refer to a specific age group in Athens, but differently in other cities.[218] When discussing children's sex life, it becomes even more difficult. For example, Pausanias in Plato's *Symposium* (180e-182a) mentions that a boy is ready when he starts to show some mind (νόος), however that is not a trait that evolves in parallel to age. Different people develop at a different pace. This seems to be in line with the information provided by other sources that discuss the sexual attractiveness of boys. The sources show that the boy is most attractive, and consequently more desired by an adult suitor, when he is on the verge of puberty, when the first signs of beard appear.[219] We do have ancient perspectives on the age of puberty: In the Hippocratic corpus (*Coac. Proenotiones*, 502) for example, it is

of rape charges on the grounds that the girls had consensual sex (https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/mar/05/france-to-raise-the-age-of-consent-after-men-escape-charges). Modern studies also point that sexual attraction for children has nothing to do with their age, but rather with the development of the youngster's body. Ames and Houston (1990: 340) argued that, for the paedophile, the most arousing aspect of his victim is the lack of secondary sex characteristics, the lack of beard on the boy's cheek or the undeveloped breasts of the girl, for example, contrary to the other sexual offenders that are attracted by the opposite. Age is not the crucial aspect of the attraction for a child, but rather their body-type. There seems to be a parallel here with ancient Greece, where most of our sources praise the body of the child without generally mentioning age.

[218] Thucydides (5.43.2) when mentioning Alcibiades, says that he would be considered too young in any other Hellenic city.

[219] For example, in the *Symposium* (181c-d), the love that Heavenly Aphrodite inspires is only for boys who are on the verge of growing a beard (τοῦτο δὲ πλησιάζει τῷ γενειάσκειν).

stated that certain diseases do not affect people under the age of puberty, which the author stipulates at fourteen:

Τάδε πρὸ ἥβης οὐ γίνεται νοσήματα, περιπλευμονικά, πλευριτικά, ποδαγρικά, νεφρῖτις, κιρσὸς περὶ κνήμην, ῥοῦς αἱματηρός, καρκίνος μὴ σύμφυτος, λεύκη μὴ συγγενής, κατάρρους νωτιαῖος, αἱμορροΐς, μὴ σύμφυτος χορδαψός· τούτων τῶν νοσημάτων πρὸ ἥβης οὐ χρὴ προσδέχεσθαι γενησόμενον οὐδέν. ἀπὸ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα μέχρι δύο καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἐτέων πάμφορος ἡ φύσις νοσημάτων ἤδη τοῦ σώματος γίνεται. πάλιν δὲ ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἡλικίης μέχρι ξγ΄ ἐτέων οὐ γίνονται χοιράδες, οὐδὲ λίθος ἐν κύστει, ἢν μὴ τύχῃ πρότερον ὑπάρχων, οὐδὲ κατάρρους νωτιαῖος, οὐδὲ νεφρῖτις, ἢν μὴ παρακολουθῶσιν ἐξ ἄλλης ἡλικίης, οὐδὲ αἱμορροΐδες, οὐδὲ ῥοῦς αἱματηρός, ἢν μὴ πρότερον τύχῃ γεγενημένος· ταῦτα μέχρι γήρως ἀπέχεται νοσήματα.

The following diseases do not arise before puberty: pneumonia, pleurisy, gout, nephritis, varicosities in the lower leg, a bloody flux, cancer (unless it is congenital), leuce (unless it is congenital), a downward flux in the back, haemorrhoids (unless they are congenital), and chordapsus; one should not expect any of these diseases to occur before puberty. From the fourteenth to the forty-second year, the nature of the body is apt to bear all diseases. But then again, from that age until sixty-three years, scrofula does not occur, nor stone in the bladder (unless it happens to have existed before), nor a downward flux in the back, nor nephritis (unless the cases are carried over from an earlier time), nor haemorrhoids, nor a bloody flux (unless it happens to have arisen before): these diseases stay away until old age.[220]

In the Aristotelian' *History of Animals* (Τῶν περὶ τὰ ζῷα ἱστοριῶν) (9(7). 581a-b), the author also establishes that the age of puberty would be around fourteen:

φέρειν δὲ σπέρμα πρῶτον ἄρχεται τὸ ἄρρεν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ ἐν τοῖς ἔτεσι τοῖς δὶς ἑπτὰ τετελεσμένοις· ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἡ5 τρίχωσις τῆς ἥβης ἄρχεται, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ φυτὰ τὰ μέλλοντα φέρειν τὸ σπέρμα ἀνθεῖ φησὶ πρῶτον Ἀλκμαίων ὁ Κροτωνιάτης. περὶ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον τοῦτον ἥ τε φωνὴ μεταβάλλειν ἄρχεται ἐπὶ τὸ τραχύτερον καὶ ἀνωμαλέστερον, οὔτ᾽ ἔτι ὀξεῖα οὖσα οὔτε πω βαρεῖα οὔτε πᾶσα ὁμαλὴ ἀλλ᾽ ὁμοία φαινομένη ταῖς παρανενευρισμέναις καὶ τραχείαις χορδαῖς· ὃ καλοῦσι τραγίζειν. […] περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ χρόνον καὶ τοῖς θήλεσιν ἥ τ᾽ ἔπαρσις γίνεται τῶν μαστῶν καὶ τὰ καταμήνια bκαλούμενα καταρρήγνυται· τοῦτο δ᾽ ἐστὶν αἷμα οἷον νεόσφακτον.

The male first begins to produce seed, as a rule, on the completion of twice seven years. At the same time the growth of the pubic hair begins, just as plants that are about to seed produce flowers first, as Alcmaeon of Croton says. At about this same time, firstly the voice begins to change, becoming rougher and more uneven, no longer high-pitched but not yet deep, nor all of one pitch, but sounding like ill-strung and rough lyre strings: what they call 'goat-voice'. […] At about the same time in the females too there develops the swelling up of the breasts, and the flow of the so-called menses is released: this is blood like that from freshly slaughtered animals.[221]

Soranus (*Gyn.* 1.20), in the second century C.E., also recognizes that around fourteen would be the common age for female puberty (δὲ ἔμμηνον ἐπιφαίνεται πρῶτον

[220] Tr. Potter.

[221] Tr. Balme.

περί τὸ τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατον). The same is said by Galen (6.2), in his treaty on hygiene (Υγιεινῶν λόγος), although recognizing that different people developed at different paces:

[…] οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ἐτῶν ἀριθμῷ περιορίσαι ταύτας, καθάπερ ἔνιοι πεποιήκασι, πλὴν ἢ κατὰ τὸ πλάτος. ἠβάσκειν οὖν ἄρχονταί τινες ἅμα τῷ πληρῶσαι τὸ τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατον ἔτος, ἔνιοι δὲ μετ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν ἢ καὶ πλείονα χρόνον.

[…] But it is not possible to define these by the number of years, as some have done, other than in broad terms. Thus, some begin to mature on completion of the fourteenth year, some a year later, and some after a longer time.

The ancient authors not only recognized the period of puberty, but also that this period might vary from person to person.[222] That the physical change does not affect everyone in the same way or at the same time, a human characteristic that is still perceptible in humans today. Therefore, stipulating an age for sex, an activity that is intrinsically related to the maturation process the body undergoes during puberty, is extremely complicated because it is impossible to rightly address everyone. Some people are physically and mentally ready to engage in consensual sexual intercourse at a very young age, and others, who take longer to develop both physically and mentally, are not. In the following sections, I explore the specific period in the life of children when it was expected of them to become sexually active, while separating the sort of sexual activity that was accepted from the one that was not.

2.3.1. Sexual age of boys

As I already stated, age in ancient Greece is a complicated topic to approach,[223] being even more complicated when discussing the age limits for sex between children

[222] Galen is clear in this point. Both the author of the *History of Animals* and Solanus mention that around (περί) fourteen is the common time for puberty. Therefore, they also recognized that it could before or after fourteen. For these references see Amundsen and Diers (1969).

[223] Davidson (2005: 71) refers to the problematics of age in ancient Greece as "a big black hole in our understanding of Greek civilization".

and adults. The specific age of the *erōmenos* has been a topic of discussion for decades.[224] Marrou (1950: 102) argues that the proper age to be an *erōmenos* should be between fifteen and eighteen. Smit (1992/93: 102) argues that twelve was the lower age. Vattuone (2004: 43-82) states that there was no specific age, but rather the ideal age gap would be between ages twelve and eighteen. Provencal (2005: 128-129n1) says that the ideal age of the *erōmenos* is between fourteen and seventeen. Richlin (2005), commentating on the age of 'penetrated' (passive) partners, states that they were normally women and boys from twelve to seventeen. Cantarella[225] estimates that the minimum acceptable age to engage in a pederastic relationship was twelve/ thirteen. Blanshard (2010:98) argues that the boy should never be younger than twelve and no older than seventeen. No theory on the sexual age of boys, however, was so scrutinized as Davidson's (2007). When discussing the age of the *erōmenos* in Athens, Davidson states that eighteen was the "age of consent", since anyone over that age could indeed be prosecuted when accused of prostitution, although if the same accusation was made to a boy under eighteen years old

[224] Curiously, age is not relevant in Dover's discussion of pederasty. Already in 1978 he observed a set of conventions that governed adult-boy erotic relationships, or more accurately the idealization of these relationships. An essential part of Dover's perception of adult-boy erotic relationships rested on his model of dominant and subordinate roles that has influenced scholars to this day. However, his contribution in *Greek Homosexuality* to our comprehension of how the Greeks perceived pederastic relationships is far from being reduced to the theorization of the active-passive model. He noted the idealization of the behaviour of the good *erastes* and *erōmenos*: how an *erōmenos* should not seek sexual pleasure from his relationship with the adult suitor; and should always play hard to get, only conceding when the adult suitor proved to be worthy. He observed that the erotic bound between adult and boy should not entail, at least ideally, actual penetration (p. 99), instead substituted by the more socially accepted intercrural sex. However, despite his description of the conventions that regulated adult-boy erotic relationships, he was certainly aware that the boy is considerably younger than the adult (as noted in his arguments (p.68; 86) concerning the representation and literary emphasis on the beard of the older man, distinguishing it from the non-bearded, younger and more attractive boys) and, simultaneously, that there was a right age to be an erōmenos (as it is perceptible from his own translations of several authors, such as Plato), but he never specifically discuss age, or the potential transgressive aspect of having sex with a prepubescent boy. Dover clearly dismisses the validity of Strato's epigrams, arguing that they do not bring anything new to the study of Greek homosexuality (p.15). The same can be said of Halperin (1990b) and Winkler (1990), whose work is highly influenced by Dover's book (as Masterson and Robson stated in their introduction to the 2016's edition of Dover's book (p. xviii), "While the models of Greek sexual mores that emerge in the pages of Foucault, Halperin and Winkler certainly contain elements that are not present in Dover, they nevertheless owe a clear debt to *Greek Homosexuality.*"). In his "Homosexuality" entry in the *OCD*, Halperin writes that the youngster in a pederastic relationship would be a boy from the start of puberty to the time he is able to grow a full beard. He states that by "boy" (*paides* or *paidika*), the Greeks would be referring to an adolescent, instead of a child, and as I have noted in this chapter those two terms cannot be read in such a linear way, since they can be used to refer to young people of different age and gender.

[225] Lear and Cantarella, 2008: 5. Also Cantarella, 2002: 36-42.

the penalty would fall on his father.[226] He bases part of this affirmation on the argument that puberty started quite late in antiquity, four or five years later than today,[227] so, according to his view, it would be normal for an eighteen-year-old male not to be able to grow a proper beard.

Davidson's argument has faced direct criticism ever since his book was published. Verstraete (2009) argues that Davidson is wrong when he states that only the eighteen and over eighteen-year-old *pais* would engage in pederastic relationships. Hubbard (2009) wrote a long review, making a very negative appraisal of the book, especially emphasising Davidson's reading of the age of the *erōmenos*,[228] where he argues that Davidson contradicts every ancient source where the age of puberty is discussed; and that he bases his argument on the later age of puberty in modern studies while ignoring the information provided by Aristotle and ancient medical writers. Laes (2010: 46), commenting on Davidson's work, argues that there was nothing like an age of consent in

[226] Davidson, 2007: 69.

[227] Davidson, 2007: 72. Skinner (2005: 11) has a different opinion on the topic of puberty, stating that it would have been much like ours, ranging from fifteen years old until eighteen. Golden (2015: 49) acknowledges that the boy would go through puberty before the age of legal majority.
Although disagreeing with the general assumptions of Davidson, Laes agrees that a great shift in the age of puberty has happened, however, this does not mean that a boy could not have is first pubic or facial hair in his mid-teens.

[228] This was a long and turbulent discussion between the authors. Davidson (2009) replied to Verstraete and Hubbard's reviews, emphasising their supposed connection to NAMBLA, arguing that their harsh appraisal of his book was motivated by hidden agendas: "Sex with minors: Obviously this is the most important issue for Verstraete and Hubbard and the reason why I have suddenly fallen so far from their favour. Hubbard's own *Greek Love Reconsidered* was published by NAMBLA, the North American Man/Boy Love Association. In his introduction to that slim volume he recommends "the outstanding work of Davidson" and draws a direct parallel between what he sees as the marginalization of paedophilia in the Athenian democracy and the marginalization of paedophiles in the modern American democracy: "even as Plato and others sold out the real pederasts ... gay leaders today sell out their brothers (and in many cases their own repressed desires) by creating the public fiction that most gays are involved in long-term monogamous age- and class-equal relationships, and that the only men attracted to teenage boys are a few sickos in NAMBLA...". Verstraete has had less success in finding a publisher for his own collection of articles on Sexual Intimacy Between Adult and Adolescent Males. Hubbard, according to a report in Inside Higher Education [Stripling, 2009], wrote to the APA demanding that it take action against Taylor and Francis if they did not publish the volume." Ormand (2009b) commenting on Davidson's response to Verstraete argued that "Anyone who works through James Davidson's recent book on Greek homosexuality will come to recognize a particular style of rhetoric, in which the author feints, ducks and misdirects when faced with evidence that contradicts his argument. This move is clearly present in Davidson's recent response to Beert Verstraete's review of his *The Greeks and Greek Love*".

Athens, and that he is wrong in assuming that *meirakion* refers to age eighteen-nineteen. Lear argues against Davidson's conception, stressing that the *erōmenoi* seem to have been of the age of modern high schoolers.[229] I believe the general scholarly opinion that boys would be deemed courtable from when they were around twelve is right, since our evidence points to the fact that it would be common for children to reach puberty at that time. The only sources that mention a specific age are quite late and convey the realities of different cities. In his biography of the Spartan legislator Lycurgus, Plutarch (*Lyc*. 17) says that in Sparta the boys could have an *erastēs* from the age of twelve. In the already quoted epigram, Strato (*AP* 12.4) provides a more detailed description for every year of the boys' youth, conveying that the period when boys are most attractive is between twelve and seventeen, and that anyone over seventeen would already be considered a mature man and consequently off-limits. According to him, the first down on the cheeks is the sign of the boy's blossoming beauty, and the coming of the full beard marks the end of the boy's desirability.[230]

Those are the only sources that mention the specific age of the *erōmenos,* however, other sources that approach the sexuality of boys in a more general manner seem to hint to the same age group. In Aristophanes, for example, it is not uncommon for characters to refer to young boys using sexual slang, such as 'penis' (πόσθων) and 'little-pecker' (ποσθαλίσκος).[231] In the *Clouds*, the Better Argument is usually attracted by schoolboys, so certainly young *paides.*[232] Xenophon (*Anab*. 7.4.7-10) tells of a man named Episthenes, from Olynthus, that he describes as a *paiderastēs*, a lover of boys, who fell in love with a beautiful boy (παῖδα κάλον) on the verge of puberty (ἡβάσκοντα ἄρτι) when he was about to be killed. Feeling the need to save a boy of such beauty, Episthenes

[229] Lear, 2014:121.
[230] For the fear that young boys had of the loss of desirability due to the appearance of hair, see Cantarella, 2002: 36-42.
[231] Ar. *Thesm*. 291; *Pax* 1300. For these references see Golden, 2015: 48.
[232] For this see Lear, 2014: 120.

begged Xenophon to help him save him. Facing this request, Xenophon asked Seuthes to spare the boy's life, considering Episthenes' care for him. In return, Seuthes asked Episthenes if he was ready to die for the boy, to which he replied by showing him his neck, stating that if the boy so commanded, he would give his head for the boy's life. Seuthes then asked the boy if he should kill Episthenes instead of him, but the boy did not want any of them to be killed. Seeing that the boy did not trade life for life, Episthenes embraced him in his arms and said to Seuthes that he would have to fight him if he still wished to kill the boy. Although Xenophon does not reveal the actual age of the boy, he mentions that he is at the beginning of puberty.[233]

In the *Cyropaedia* (1.6.34), Cambyses explains to Cyrus that the Persians do not discuss sexual subjects in front of very young children (ἀγάν νέους), considering that then they would feel free to pursue their passions in an unmoderated way. In Plato's *Lysis* (204d-204e), Lysis himself is said to be very young (ὁ Λύσις νέος τις), to the point that Socrates does not immediately recognize his name. The background for the discussion in this treaty is the *Hermaia*, a sports festival in honour of Hermes and Herakles, legally restricted to boys only.[234] In the *Symposium* (181c-d) the love that Heavenly Aphrodite inspires is only for boys who are on the verge of growing a beard (τοῦτο δὲ πλησιάζει τῷ γενειάσκειν). In *Charmides* (155a), Socrates' reaction shows that older men were not supposed to be involved in a pederastic relationship with boys that were too young, although, in this case, this social rule was bypassed by the previous agreement with Critias. Independently of Socrates' intentions not being to enter a sexual relationship, the fact is that he felt an enormous sexual desire, despite Charmides not being in the required age group, and his reaction depicts how negative that desire was. A certain sense of social morality is present in this action according to which sexual involvement between children

[233] Brownson translates *hēbaskonta arti* as "just in the bloom of youth". Golden (2015: 49), commentating on this passage, states that the boy should be "fourteen or so".
[234] On this see the Solonian law mentioned by Aeschines (1.10).

under a certain state of maturation and men was not permitted, something that, in a way, has accompanied Western civilization until today.

Based on the available evidence, I argue that it is safe to assume that, despite the question of age in ancient Greece being always somewhat volatile, a boy to be engaged in a pederastic relationship could never be younger then twelve/thirteen years old. This would be a common age for the first signs of beard and so signalling the start of puberty, the beginning of the maturation process that turns a child into a man, and also recognized as the time when a man is more beautiful.[235] It was the time, according to the *Symposium*, when they start to show some mind. In my view, it makes absolute sense that a pederastic education entailing both a pedagogical, where the boy was supposed to learn how to become a valuable citizen, and a sexual side should begin when the boy starts to physically develop into a man.

Therefore, if a boy could engage in a sexual relationship from when he was around twelve, without breaking any law or social prerogatives, when discussing the sexual abuse of boys, we must focus on examples under this age, the already mentioned prepubescent *paides*. This is the behaviour that we can indeed denominate as para-philia, since it exceeds the boundaries of regular sexual contact. Boundaries exist for a reason and trespassing them usually provokes a repercussion. This limit also shows that there was profounder understanding of different stages in the life of a male *pais* in ancient Greece than the sources usually convey. I believe that, at least in Athens, there would be a distinction of different age groups within the scope of *paides*. That seems to have been the case in some sporting events, such as the games of the Greater Theseia festival in Athens, where a stratification of *paides* seems to have occurred. In several of the competitions that occurred during those days, the competing *paides* were divided into

[235] In the *Odyssey* (10.279), Hermes is described as physically resembling a young man showing the first signs of beard, supposedly being the most attractive phase of a man's life. For the unattractiveness of hair see *A.P.* 12.4; 12. 31; 12. 33; 12.35; 12.186. See also Cantarella, 2002: 37-38.

three different groups, so the competition could be fair. Those groups were *paides tes protes helikias, paides tes deuteras helikias* and *paides tes trites helikias*, 'boys of first age', 'boys of second age' and 'boys of third age' respectively.[236] The evidence for this comes from several inscriptions of the second century B.C.E., however according to Plutarch (*Thes*. 36, *Cim.* 8) it was during the archonship of Phaedo (476-475 B.C.E.) that Cimon recovered the bones of Theseus when conquering the island of Scyros, and took them back to Athens, where he was honoured on the eighth of the month Pyanepsion, the supposed day when Theseus returned from Crete. We do not know when the Greater Theseia, supposedly organized every four years while the lesser Theseia happened yearly, was instituted. Pélékidis (1962: 229-230) argues that it could have been instituted in 166 B.C.E., when Athens regained control over Skyros, and that the athletic events would only happen during the greater festival. Walker (1995: 101n128) disagrees, arguing that the athletic competitions happened frequently in the Theseia, and so could not be limited to one single major event, every four years. Independently of the actual institution of the festival and the sports competitions, the Theseia is a clear example of the necessity to distinguish age groups within the broad age concept of *paides*, and I do believe that in the case of sexual approach to boys a similar distinction was made, at least from *paides* that were too young from the ones that were already old enough.

The stratification of *paides* in the Theseia shows us that it was possible to distinguish between *paides* of different ages, and so, in the context of sexual relationships, it would be possible to discern boys that were too young from boys that were mature enough, although all of them could be called *paides*. Cantarella (2002: 44) seems to have thought on similar grounds, even proposing an age system for male *paides*, that, in her opinion, were divided in three different age groups: *paides* under twelve, and so off limits

[236] For this see Kennell, 1999.

to adult suitors,[237] *paides* between twelve and fifteen, that could be courted but, considering their young age, they would be more protected, and a third group of *paides* from fifteen until eighteen (when they are no longer *paides* but *neaniskoi*) who would be considered mature enough to make their own decisions. Although I am not completely persuaded by every aspect of Cantarella's proposal, specifically concerning her argument that we have no evidence whatsoever of legal punishment, nonetheless I do believe that some *paides* would be considered too young to be courted, off limits to the adult man who had to wait until the boy matures. This maturation would be physically visible since it would correspond to the development of the secondary sexual characteristics, such as the first signs of facial hair that would commonly occur around twelve-fourteen years of age. In the following sections I explore the surviving expressions of desire for boys and the evidence of legislation that sought to protect those boys.

2.3.2. Sexual age of girls

The logic behind the lower age limit for boys' sexual intercourse seems to be like girls' sexuality. As already noted, twelve to fifteen would be a common age for the first menstruation, the sign that female bodies were ready to perform their role in society: marriage and consequently the birth of new citizens.[238] However, contrary to boys and their introduction to sex within a pederastic context, the social dynamics of the ancient world dictate that the first (and general) contact that a freeborn woman should have with

[237] However, she notes that "so far as we can discover, there were no legal penalties for anybody who did so". As it will become clear in the section where I analyse possible legal penalties, I do not agree with Cantarella on this point.

[238] Euphiletus (Lys. 1.6) recounts that he fully accepted his wife only after she had given birth to their first child, and he had seen that she did not spend her days chatting at the doorstep. In Apollodorus' (Dem. 59.122) division of women, it is clear that the wife's function is reproduction. Pomeroy (1975: 62) wrote a phrase that I believe sums up this matter quite well: "The death of a young girl often elicited lamentations specifically over her failure to fulfil her intended role as a wife". See also Chrystal, 2017: 77-78.

sex is within the bounds of matrimony. Sexual intercourse outside of wedlock would constitute a terrible hit to the girl's, and her family's, reputation. This is clear already in the Cologne fragment of Archilochus, from the seventh century B.C.E. poet from the island of Paros, when he attacks Neoboule because she engaged in premarital sex,[239] and so marrying such a girl would reflect poorly on himself.[240]

The dawn of puberty signalized the transition from childhood to pre-marital status, the passage from *pais* to *parthenos* that could even be marked by religious rituals.[241] *Parthenos,* as specific age terminology, does not always refer to pubescent girls, or girls on the verge of puberty. It can be used to refer to a female, a maiden, either of marriageable age or not.[242] That is clear in the words of Pausanias (7.26.5) for example, when he says that the priestess of Artemis is a maiden (παρθένος), who holds the post until she reaches a marriageable age (ἱερᾶται δὲ παρθένος, ἔστ᾽ ἂν ἐς ὥραν ἀφίκηται γάμου). Pausanias uses *parthenos* to refer to a prepubescent girl, under the age span of twelve-fourteen years old, although in this situation he could refer to the girl as *pais*. This should not be a surprise, since the vocabulary that addresses different age spans of boys is also fairly adaptable. Pausanias is very aware that *parthenos* may refer to girls of different ages, of both marriageable age and under. In the description of the festival of Hera in Elis, he speaks of a traditional race of maidens (δρόμου παρθένοις), where competitors of different ages (πᾶσαι ἡλικίας) would run, although only against adversaries of the same age, with the youngest (νεώταται) *parthenoi* being the first to compete. Since they were all unmarried girls, this stratification hints that the younger girls

[239] For this fragment see James, 2012.

[240] In another archaic example, in the *Odyssey*, Nausicaa is quite mindful of the potential damage of gossip to her reputation, when she finds Odysseus on the beach.

[241] Sissa (1990: 76) sums up this question brilliantly: "Determined by age and marital status, virginity [*parthenia*] was thus a stage through which every woman passed on her way to full social integration. It coincided with nubility and implied proximity to as well as psychological readiness for marriage. A temporal and teleonomic notion, the word *parthenos*, we are told simply denoted the expectant hiatus between childhood and *gamos*". See also Dillon, 2002: 211-235. For the rituals of Artemis in Brauron, see Budin, 2016: 77-80.

[242] Gaca (2014: 315), despite recognizing that *parthenoi* may also be used to refer to little girls, provides several examples where the destination is made, namely in Euripides and Philoxenus.

would be prepubescents, and so not yet ready for marriage, while the oldest category might be composed of girls of marriageable age.

However, girls did not marry at the same age in every *polis*. In Sparta, unlike Athens, it seems that women married at an older age, around eighteen or twenty years old.[243] In Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* (7.5), a dialogue that focus mainly on household management and agriculture, Ischomachus, an Athenian farmer, states that his wife was not yet fifteen when they married, so a fourteen-year-old girl, which would be the common age for the girl to marry in Athens, an age that roughly corresponds to the lower age limits for the *erōmenos.* As Vivante (2007: 54) noted, to Xenophon marriage should occur right after the menarche, and the girl should be paired with an older man that would be able to teach her how to manage the household.[244] However, contrary to boys who engaged in a pederastic relationship, a girl had no power of decision concerning marriage, which instead rested in the hands of their *kurios*. Not only would the *kurios* have the power to arrange the girl's match, but also the power to break the betrothal and marry her to another man he saw fit. That is supposedly what happened between Archilochus and Neoboule, who were set to marry but afterwards her father decided to choose another suitor.[245]

Therefore, the sources show that female children would be ready to start their sexual life roughly at the same time as male *paides*, although their first sexual experiences were deeply different. The menarche symbolises their transition from children, and so unavailable for sex, to a pre-marital *parthenos* who should only be touched by their husband. Desiring a freeborn female *pais*, and acting on those urges, would put the adult

[243] Vivante, 2007: 54. See also Chrystal, 2017: 97-106.

[244] There seem to have been cases where menarche was not necessary for marriage, which hints at girls marrying even before the first signs of puberty (for this see Glazebrook and Olson, 2014: 70). On the other side, there were those who argued that girls should marry at a later stage. Plato (*Lg.* 6.785b) says that girls should be married only when they are sixteen-twenty years old, and Aristotle (*Pol.* 1253b) argues that girls who are married at a young age suffer more in childbirth (for this see Robson, 2013: 16; 179; 221).

[245] Archil. *Testimonia* 29. For this see Crysthal, 2017: 73.

in a dangerous situation, liable to capital punishment. I explore the surviving expressions of sexual desire for female children in the next section.

2.3.3. Sexual age of slaves

Slaves, either children or adults, had no power of consent and were completely available to the sexual cravings of their masters.[246] The premise of slavery nullifies the rules of sexuality that regulate the world of freeborn people, and so, when speaking of child sexuality, slave children were available for sexual exploitation, regardless of their age.[247] There is no sexual abuse of children, when the child is a slave. They were forced to obey their master's whims and failing or refusal to follow their orders could be met with harsh punishment, which could sometimes be expressed through sexual violence. In the *Acharnians* (271-76), the farmer Dicaeopolis invokes Phales, rejoicing the opportunity he had to sexually assault a slave girl, as punishment for stealing wood.[248]

As far as I can tell, there was no lower age limit for the sexual exploitation of a child slave. The sources generally do not convey any special interest from men in child slaves, and even when we consider a wartime scenario, where little girls and boys were among the victims of massive rape, grown women and girls of marriageable age seem to have been the most targeted.[249] However, children were among the spoils of war, thus becoming slaves of the conqueror and entirely at the disposal of their masters. The already

[246] Xenophon (*Oec.* 10.12) expresses the lack of capacity to consent of female slaves, who are always subjected to their master's wishes.

[247] Later Roman sources provide several examples of this sexual availability of slave children. Valerius Maximus finds the idea that two men died when they were having sex with two boys somewhat entertaining. As Golden and Toohey (2011: 13) rightfully note, no "Roman, let alone a stern moralist such as Valerius, would find sex with freeborn boys a laughing matter". He is most likely referring to two slave children. Horace, a few decades before Valerius, advised anyone feeling aroused to just use a slave girl or boy (Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.114-19).

[248] For this see Johnson, Ryan, 2005: 154 and Robson, 2015. For rape as punishment see Kamen, 2013: 11.

[249] Kathy Gaca's work is unavoidable when discussing the sexual abuse perpetrated by conquering armies. See Gaca, 2012, 2014, 2015.

mentioned episode, narrated by Xenophon (*Anab*. 7.4.7-10), between Episthenes and Seuthes mentions that the former fell in love with a beautiful boy (παῖδα κάλον) on the verge of puberty (ἠβάσκοντα ἄρτι) when he was about to be killed. The boy, being the defeated party, has no choice in the matter of becoming sexually available to Episthenes, and although Xenophon's narrative does not convey an episode of sexual violence perpetrated by Episthenes, the forced sexual availability of the boy is nevertheless clear.

When conveying the story of the Carthaginian conquest of Selinus in 409 B.C.E., in the context of the second Sicilian war, Diodorus Siculus (13.57-58) tells how the women of the sacked city were ravaged, as well as their marriageable (ἐπιγάμους) daughters, that were forced to sexual actions that were not suitable for their age (οὐκ οἰκεῖα τῆς ἡλικίας).[250] According to him, no free girl (παίδων ἐλευθέρων) or maiden was spared, and all surviving females became slaves. In the already mentioned letter of Isocrates to Archidamos III, the orator states (9.8-10) that small Greek forces in Ionia had gone rogue, and instead of seeking to damage Persian territories they would pillage and destroy any Greek cities they entered. In those cities, they violated (ὑβρίζω)[251] little girls and women (παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας). Supposedly those females were not taken as slaves, but rather left in misery, wandering through the streets of the city without the means to sustain themselves.

War was one of the main suppliers of slaves, also fuelling the market of slave children prostitution. The most famous example was Neaira, who supposedly started her trade when she was very young, being among the "group of small girls" (παιδίσκας ἐκ

[250] Oldfather translates θυγατέρας ἐπιγάμους as "daughters of marriageable age", while Gaca (2012: 94) chooses to translate as "marriageable daughters". I followed Gaca's translation here, because if ἐπιγάμους refers to age instead of status, the next line by Diodorus, οὐκ οἰκεῖα τῆς ἡλικίας "things not suitable for their age", becomes cryptic. What are those things that are not suitable for their age, if not sex *per se*? If the Carthaginians were perpetrating any form of sexual violence other than penetrative sex, such action would not be suitable for a woman of any age. Therefore, Diodorus must be referring to girls on the cusp of womanhood, of the transition stage of *pais* to *parthenos*, who were not yet ready for sex, and so being submitted to sex by the Carthaginians is a thing not suitable for their age.

[251] Norlin chose to translate *hybrizō* as "treat with indignity", however I agree with both Gaca (2012: 101-102) and Papillon (2004: 279) that *hybrizō* is referring to sexual violence.

μικρῶν παιδίων) acquired by Nikaretê, whose capacity to recognize beauty and sexual potential in girls of tender age was famous. Although the specific age is not defined, which as already shown is far from being uncommon in ancient Greek sources, the emphasis on their youth, *mikrōn paidiōn*, allows us to assume that they would be prepubescent children. As Keuls (1985: 157) noticed, by not being of an appropriate age to engage in sexual intercourse,[252] Neaira became what Aristophanes calls a *hypoparthenos hetaera*, a "not-yet-maiden-harlot".[253] The existence of such a category of prostitute suggests that such practices must have been somewhat common, not only for female child prostitutes, but also for males. In a society where boys were sexually objectified, it is likely that boy prostitutes would be much requested. As I have discussed in the previous section, the sources suggest that the number of potential *erōmenoi* was vastly surpassed by the number of suitors, and for a boy lover who was not an interesting suitor for a freeborn boy, a child slave would certainly be a cheaper and more accessible way to fulfil his cravings.

Despite child prostitution being a potentially high-income business, forcibly prostituting free-born girls and women was expressly forbidden after Solon (Pl. *Sol.* 23).[254] The *proagōgeias graphē* (προαγωγείας γραφή) quoted by Aeschines (1.14), and attributed to Solon, sentences to death anyone who prostitutes a freeborn boy or woman. Although there is not a specific reference to the prostitution of free-born girls in the quotation of the law by Aeschines, it is considered that the law also applied to them.[255]

[252] Dem. 59.22. νεωτέρα δὲ οὖσα διὰ τὸ μήπω τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτῇ παρεῖναι.
[253] I have followed Keuls' translation. On this see also Johnson, Ryan, 2005: 88.
[254] Musonius Rufus, in the first century C.E., wrote about a man who prostituted his beautiful son.
[255] On this see McGinn, 2014: 86.

2.4. Sexual desire for prepubescent *paides*

2.4.1. Sexual desire for prepubescent boys

In one of his surviving epigrams, Strato (*AP*. 12.205) alludes to the sexual desire that an adult could feel for a prepubescent boy, although simultaneously emphasising that those boys were off-limits:

Παῖς τις ὅλως ἁπαλὸς τοῦ γείτονος οὐκ ὀλίγως με
κνίζει· πρὸς τὸ θέλειν δ᾽ οὐκ ἀμύητα γελᾷ·
οὐ πλεῖν δ᾽ ἐστὶν ἐτῶν δύο καὶ δέκα. νῦν ἀφύλακτοι
ὄμφακες· ἢν δ᾽ ἀκμάσῃ, φρούρια καὶ σκόλοπες.

My neighbour's quite tender young boy provokes me not a little,
and laughs in no novice manner to show me that he is willing.
But he is not more than twelve years old. Now the unripe grapes are unguarded;
when he ripens there will be watchmen and stakes.[256]

The epigram presents a scenario where a boy, too young to be courted, shows his sexual availability to an outsider man. The display achieves part of the boy's intention: he is able to captivate the man's attention, kindling his sexual appetite to the point of making him think about a potential sexual engagement. However, the man quickly concludes that a sexual encounter with his neighbour's boy is impossible, since he is not yet old enough. This epigram follows the line of the other Strato's text that I have already mentioned (*AP*. 12.4), where he mentions examples of the different age of the *erōmenos,* establishing twelve as the lower limit. The neighbour's boy clearly is not mature enough, and that is shown not only by Strato's reference to his age, but also by his general behaviour. The boy's sexual overture shows a lack of the control and good judgement that should be characteristics of a good *erōmenos,* clearly implying that he is not yet mature enough and does not yet possess the mind, the *noos*, mentioned in the *Symposium*.

[256] Tr. Paton.

In another epigram (*AP* 12.228), Strato continues to allude to the correct way of loving boys, by stating that when an immature boy does something he should not, due to his insensible age, the blame falls on the one who persuaded him:

Παῖδα μὲν ἠλιτόμηνον ἐς ἄφρονα καιρὸν ἁμαρτεῖν,
τῷ πείθοντι φέρει πλεῖον ὕβρισμα φίλῳ.
ἤδη δ᾽ ἐν νεότητι παρήλικα παιδικὰ πάσχειν,
τῷ παρέχοντι πάλιν τοῦτο δὶς αἰσχρότερον.
ἔστι δ᾽ ὅτ᾽ ἀμφοτέροις τὸ μὲν οὐκέτι, Μοῖρι, τὸ δ᾽ οὔπω
ἁπρεπές, οἷον ἐγὼ καὶ σὺ τὸ νῦν ἔχομεν.

That an immature boy should do despite to his insensible age
carries more disgrace to the friend who tempts him than to himself,
and for a grown-up youth to submit to penetration, his season for which is past,
is twice as disgraceful to him who consents as it is to his tempter.
But there is a time, Moeris, when it is no longer unseemly in the one,
and not yet so in the other, as is the case with you and me at present.[257]

In the epigram it is considered that the man who takes advantage of the naiveness of a boy is repulsive. Although these texts are of a poetic nature, and therefore need to be approached with extra caution, nevertheless Strato's epigrams are in line with other sources already explored in this chapter that convey the boundaries surrounding boy love, so, in my opinion, it is fair to assume that this would be the general social behaviour, and not just one person's prejudice towards men who target immature *paides*.

There is one further example to explore. When attacking Demosthenes, Dinarchus (1.23) argues that, in the past, the jury had harshly punished other men for much lesser crimes than the ones committed by Demosthenes:

ὑμεῖς ἔσθ᾽ οἱ διὰ πολλῷ τῶν ὑπὸ τούτου πεπραγμένων ἀδικημάτων ἐλάττω μεγάλας καὶ ἀπαραιτήτους ἐνίοις ἐπιτεθηκότες τιμωρίας. ὑμεῖς Μένωνα μὲν τὸν μυλωθρὸν ἀπεκτείνατε, διότι παῖδ᾽ ἐλεύθερον ἐκ Πελλήνης ἔσχεν ἐν τῷ μυλῶνι· Θεμίστιον δὲ τὸν Ἀφιδναῖον, διότι τὴν Ῥοδίαν κιθαρίστριαν ὕβρισεν Ἐλευσινίοις. θανάτῳ ἐζημιώσατε, Εὐθύμαχον δέ, διότι τὴν Ὀλυνθίαν παιδίσκην ἔστησεν ἐπ᾽ οἰκήματος.

You imposed extreme and inexorable penalties on others for crimes of much less import than those perpetrated by this man. You executed Menon the miller because he had a free boy from Pallene in his mill.

[257] Tr. Paton slighted adapted.

You inflicted death on Themistius of Aphidna because he assaulted the Rhodian lyre player at the Eleusinia, and on Euthymachus because he put the Olynthian girl in his brothel.[258]

His first example was Menon the miller, who had a free boy from Pallene in his mill, and for such was sentenced to death. We do not know anything else about this case. He then proceeds to mention two other situations where the culprit was sentenced to death: one man named Themistius from Aphnida for the rape of a cithara player from Rhodes, and Euthymachus for forcing a girl from Olynthus to prostitute herself in a brothel. The first example provided by Dinarchus is particularly interesting. Harris (2013: 53-54) argues that both Menon and Euthymachus were sentenced for a similar crime. In both cases there was no denying that the culprits ignored the citizen status of the two persons, forcing the first to work in the mill, considered a hard job even for slaves, and the woman to prostitute herself. Phillips (2013: 123) considers the three examples under the category of sexual offences, and more specifically as a crime of pandering. In fact, Dinarchus does not make any reference to what happened to the Pallene boy, just that he was kept (ἔσχεν) in the mill. The only thing we know is the boy was of a free status (παῖδ' ἐλεύθερον), and since the sentence was carried out, we know he was in the mill against his own will. We do not have any reference to what he was forced to do, since the vocabulary used does not directly imply hard work, or any other work for that matter. But even if we consider the possibility that he was forced to work in the mill, therefore being treated like a slave, we could nevertheless question what other sort of demands were made of him. If he was treated as a slave by Menon, it is also possible that he was sexually used, a hypothesis that Philips seems in part to consider, since he listed this example under a category of sexual offences. We should consider why Menon would force a young free man to work instead of using a slave. Even if he could not afford a slave, it would be less risky to abduct a slave than a free boy, and the sentence would most likely be lighter. My

[258] Tr. Worthington.

argument is that there are at least fair grounds to consider the possibility that Menon kept the boy for sexual reasons. There is no reference to the age of the *pais*, however in this case the sentence would most likely be the same, independently of the boy being pubescent or prepubescent, since he was denied his citizen rights.

2.4.2. Sexual desire for prepubescent girls

As in the examples that I have just explored, most of the references to sexual desire for female children are found in epigrams. In one of the surviving epigrams of Anacreon, the sixth-fifth century B.C.E. lyric poet (417), the author writes about his sexual desires for a very young girl:[259]

πῶλε Θρῃκίη, τί δή με
λοξὸν ὄμμασι βλέπουσα
νηλέως φεύγεις, δοκεῖς δέ
μ᾽ οὐδὲν εἰδέναι σοφόν;
ἴσθι τοι, καλῶς μὲν ἄν τοι
τὸν χαλινὸν ἐμβάλοιμι,
ἡνίας δ᾽ ἔχων στρέφοιμί
σ᾽ ἀμφὶ τέρματα δρόμου·
νῦν δὲ λειμῶνάς τε βόσκεαι
κοὖφά τε σκιρτῶσα παίζεις,
δεξιὸν γὰρ ἱππορείρην
οὐκ ἔχεις ἐπεμβάτην.

Thracian filly, why do you look at me
from the corner of your eye
and flee stubbornly from me,
supposing that I have no skill?
Let me tell you, I could neatly put the bridle on you
and with the reins in my hand wheel you
round the turn post of the racecourse;
instead, you graze in the meadows
and frisk and frolic lightly,
since you have no skilled horseman to ride you.[260]

[259] This and several almost all the other examples analysed in this section were also explored by Gaca, 2014.
[260] Tr. Campbell.

The identification of the female as a child is made in the first two words of the epigram, *pōle Thrēkiē*. The author identifies the girl as being from Thrace, so we are most likely seeing a Thracian girl that was taken as a slave. By comparing the girl to a filly, a very young female horse not yet ready for breeding, the author clarifies that the object of his desire is too young to be sexually experienced. That is made clearer by the following lines, especially when Anacreon says that the girl chooses to stay in the meadow (λειμῶνας). Although the choice of words continues Anacreon's bestial metaphor, the reference to the girl in the meadow is, as we have seen in the previous chapter, a common *topos* of mythical accounts of rape and seduction.[261] The phrasing of what the girl is doing in the meadow (κοῦφά τε σκιρτῶσα παίζεις) emphasizes her childishness. The conclusion once again works to reassert her youth, by stressing that she is alone in the meadow because she does not have a lover, which fits the pattern of her age.

In Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* (479-80), Euripides' kinsman, who is disguised as a woman, so he could meddle among the assembly of women, tries to defend Euripides by telling a made-up story:

[…] ὅτε νύμφη μὲν ἦν τρεῖς ἡμέρας,
ὁ δ᾽ ἀνὴρ παρ᾽ ἐμοὶ καθηῦδεν. ἦν δέ μοι φίλος,
ὅσπερ με διεκόρησεν οὖσαν ἑπτέτιν.
οὗτος πόθῳ μου ᾽κνυεν ἐλθὼν τὴν θύραν·
κᾆτ᾽ εὐθὺς ἔγνων· εἶτα καταβαίνω λάθρᾳ.
ὁ δ᾽ ἀνὴρ ἐρωτᾷ· "ποῖ σὺ καταβαίνεις;" "ὅποι;
στρόφος μ᾽ ἔχει τὴν γαστέρ᾽, ὦνερ, κὠδύνη·
εἰς τὸν κοπρῶν᾽ οὖν ἔρχομαι." "βάδιζέ νυν."
κᾆθ᾽ ὁ μὲν ἔτριβε κεδρίδας, ἄννηθον, σφάκον·
ἐγὼ δὲ καταχέασα τοῦ στροφέως ὕδωρ
ἐξῆλθον ὡς τὸν μοιχόν· εἶτ᾽ ἠρείδομαι
παρὰ τὸν Ἀγυιᾶ κῦβδ᾽, ἐχομένη τῆς δάφνης.
ταῦτ᾽ οὐδεπώποτ᾽ εἶφ᾽, ὁρᾶτ᾽, Εὐριπίδης·

I'd been married only three days,
and my husband was sleeping beside me. But I had a boyfriend
who'd deflowered me when I was seven
and still had the hots for me. He came scratching at the door
and I knew right away who it was. I start to steal downstairs,
and my husband asks, "Where are you going downstairs?" "Where?

[261] Once again, on this topic see Deacy, 2013.

I've got colic and achiness in my stomach, husband,
so I'm going to the can." "Go on then."
And he starts grinding up juniper berries, dillweed, and sage,
while I pour water into the door socket
and go out to meet my lover. Then I bend over,
holding onto the laurel tree by Apollo's Pillar, and get my humping.
Euripides has never said anything about that, see what I mean?[262]

The story is made up within the play, simply used to show that Euripides was also benevolent towards women. To better emphasise that benevolence, the disguised kinsman brought forth the most awful, terrible transgression that he could attribute to a woman: being unfaithful to her husband. In this story, however, the transgression becomes even more severe because of two factors: the sexual act when the husband is at home; and the fact that the woman was having a long-term sexual relationship that started before her wedding. In the story, the woman was deflowered (διεκόρησεν), by the same man, when she was seven years old. As I have already noted, seven is too young for a girl to be married, so this is a case that exceeds the common Athenian norm.[263] The girl was not raped, since she chose to have intercourse with her lover, at such young age. Aristophanes' intention is to present the most outrageous story about a woman,[264] and so he comes up with a woman that is characterized by an uncontrollable sexual appetite, that made herself sexually available outside of wedlock, to a man that she would not marry, at an age where sexual intercourse would not be allowed to a girl.[265]

In an epigram (*AP*. 5.124) entitled *eis Lysidikēn parthenon*, the first century B.C.E. philosopher Philodemus displays his sexual desire for a girl, named Lysidice:

Οὔπω σοι καλύκων γυμνὸν θέρος, οὐδὲ μελαίνει

[262] Tr. Henderson.
[263] Both Sommerstein (1994: 187) and Austin, Olson (2004: 199), when commentating on this passage make a reference to Tzetzes *On Lycophron* (102-103), where Helen was kidnapped by Theseus at a very young age. Austin, Olson (2004: 199) also refer to Isocrates 10.18, when the orator speaks of the same myth, and specifies that Helen was not yet in the prime of her beauty (ἀκμάζουσαν), therefore under marriable age, when Theseus fell in love with her.
[264] See Robson, 2006: 51; MacDowell, 1995: 263-64.
[265] Cottone (2016: 227) highlights how important it is for a girl to be seven in Athens, since she would, at that stage, would be able to participate in the Arrhephoria.

βότρυς ὁ παρθενίους πρωτοβολῶν χάριτας,
ἀλλ᾽ ἤδη θοὰ τόξα νέοι θήγουσιν Ἔρωτες,
Λυσιδίκη, καὶ πῦρ τύφεται ἐγκρύφιον.
φεύγωμεν, δυσέρωτες, ἕως βέλος οὐκ ἐπὶ νευρῇ·
μάντις ἐγὼ μεγάλης αὐτίκα πυρκαϊῆς.

Your summer crop is not yet bare of its husks,
nor has the grape darkened and brought forth its first virgin charms,
but already the young Loves sharpen their swift arrows,
Lysidice, and a hidden fire is smouldering.
Let us flee, we unlucky lovers, before the arrow is on the string;
I prophesy a sudden great conflagration.[266]

He is unmistakably addressing a female child. He starts by emphasising that her "summer crop is not yet bare of its husks, nor has the grape darkened and brought forth its first virgin charms" (Οὔπω σοι καλύκων γυμνὸν θέρος, οὐδὲ μελαίνει βότρυς ὁ παρθενίους πρωτοβολῶν χάριτας). His metaphor for her age is quite similar to the one used by Strato to define the neighbour's boy who provokes him. By stressing that the grape is yet unripe, Philodemus is clearly implying that the girl is not yet of marriageable age, or as he says, not yet showing her first virgin charms (παρθενίους χάριτας). It is a reference to the quasi-marital status of maidens, girls that are already going through the first stages of puberty, but not yet married. By saying that Lysidice is yet to show those first signs of puberty, it becomes even clearer that the author is referring to a female child.

In another epigram, entitled *Erotic advice* (ἐρωτικὴ παραίνεσις) (*AP*. 5.20), Honestus of Corinth,[267] specifies what he looks for in a woman:

Οὔτε με παρθενικῆς τέρπει γάμος οὔτε γεραιῆς·
τὴν μὲν ἐποικτείρω, τὴν δὲ καταιδέομαι.
εἴη μήτ᾽ ὄμφαξ μήτ᾽ ἀσταφίς· ἡ δὲ πέπειρος
ἐς Κύπριδος θαλάμους ὥρια καλλοσύνη.

Neither marriage to a young girl nor to an old woman excites me;
the one I pity, the other I revere.
Let her be neither an unripe grape nor a dried raisin;
beauty is ripe in the season for Cypris' bedchamber.[268]

[266] Tr. Paton.
[267] Nothing is known about this author, apart from his supposed place of origin.
[268] Tr. Paton slighted adapted.

Honestus states that what he seeks is beauty in the appropriated age, neither girls too young, that he calls "unripe grapes" (ὄμφαξ), neither the "dried raisins" (ἀσταφίς), old women. Here we have once again the fruit metaphor that indicates children that are not yet mature enough to engage in sexual intercourse. As Gaca (2014: 343-344) pointed out, in this epigram Honestus is contrasting his sexual preferences with the ones of men that preferred underdeveloped girls, grapes not yet ripe.

We also have references to the prostitution of girls, and to how sexually appealing a free-born girl could be to the wealthy man:

Ἑπτὰ γὰρ ταύτας παιδίσκας ἐκ μικρῶν παιδίων ἐκτήσατο Νικαρέτη, Χαρισίου μὲν οὖσα τοῦ Ἠλείου ἀπελευθέρα, Ἱππίου δὲ τοῦ μαγείρου τοῦ ἐκείνου γυνή, δεινὴ δὲ φύσιν μικρῶν παιδίων συνιδεῖν εὐπρεπῆ, καὶ ταῦτα ἐπισταμένη θρέψαι καὶ παιδεῦσαι ἐμπείρως, τέχνην ταύτην κατεσκευασμένη καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων τὸν βίον συνειλεγμένη. προσειποῦσα δ᾽ αὐτὰς ὀνόματι θυγατέρας, ἵν᾽ ὡς μεγίστους μισθοὺς πράττοιτο τοὺς βουλομένους πλησιάζειν αὐταῖς ὡς ἐλευθέραις οὔσαις, ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἐκαρπώσατο αὐτῶν ἑκάστης, συλλήβδην καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀπέδοτο ἁπασῶν ἑπτὰ οὐσῶν, Ἄντειαν καὶ Στρατόλαν καὶ Ἀριστόκλειαν καὶ Μετάνειραν καὶ Φίλαν καὶ Ἰσθμιάδα καὶ Νέαιραν ταυτηνί

There were these seven girls who were purchased while they were small children by Nicaretê, who was the freedwoman of Charisius the Eleana and the wife of his cook Hippias. She was skilled in recognizing the budding beauty of small girls and knew well how to bring them up and train them artfully; for she made this her profession, and she got her livelihood from the girls. She called them by the name of daughters in order that, by giving out that they were free women, she might exact the largest fees from those who wished to enjoy them. When she had reaped the profit of the youthful prime of each, she sold them, all seven, without omitting one—Anteia and Stratola and Aristocleia and Metaneira and Phila and Isthmias and this Neaera.[269]

According to Apollodorus (Dem.59.18-20), Nikaretê presented the little girls (παιδίσκαι) she acquired, among them Neaira, as her own daughters, so to attract a more specific clientele: men who paid higher fees just to have the opportunity to be with a young, free born girl, served by their own mother. It is an example of a recognized male sexual fetish that was profitable to satisfy. There is actually more than one possible

[269] Tr. Murray slighted adapted. Murray translates the first instance of the expression *mikrōn paidiōn* as "small children", but when it is used again, three lines after, he opts to translate it by "young girls". I preferred to translate *mikrōn paidiōn* as "small girls" in this instance, since *paidiōn* clearly refers to female children in this case, and the repetition of the adjective *mikrōn* clearly emphasises the prepubescent and inexperience state of those girls, a reality that I think that is not clearly expressed by 'young girls'.

reading here: First, since Nikaretê was herself free,[270] making her own young daughters available she is creating the opportunity for any man to have sex with a freeborn girl that, in a normal scenario, he would not be able to; and second, by selling to a client the possibility to have sex with her own daughter, Nikaretê might quiet possibly be fulfilling the sexual fetish of a man who specifically wants the consent of the mother to sexually use her daughter. Moreover, Apollodorus seems to imply that there was a market for the prostitution of female children, since the seven girls were acquired at a very young age, to be trained and made sexually available.[271]

The selling of sexual favours of one's family was not completely uncommon in ancient Athens. In Isaeus' speech *On the Estate of Pyrrhus*, the speaker accuses Nicodemus of perjury, arguing that he had lied when swearing that he had given his sister in marriage to Phyrrus. Supposedly, from this union a daughter named Phile was born and therefore, being a legitimate daughter of Phyrrus, she was the legitimate heir of his estate. Among several accusations against Nicodemus, Isaeus (3.10-11) seems to imply that Nicodemus had profited from selling the services of his sister more than once:

καὶ πρὸς τούτοις εἴ τις ἄλλος ἐγγυητὴν ἔσχε τὴν τούτου ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα, ἢ τῶν πρότερον χρησαμένων πρὶν γνῶναι τὸν ἡμέτερον θεῖον αὐτήν, ἢ ὅσοι ἐκείνου γιγνώσκοντος ἐπλησίαζον αὐτῇ, ἢ ὅσοι ὕστερον ἐπλησίαζον τετελευτηκότος ἐκείνου· δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτὴν ἅπασι τοῖς πλησιάζουσιν ἐκδέδωκεν. περὶ ὧν εἰ δεήσειε καθ᾽ ἕκαστον διελθεῖν, οὐκ ἂν πάνυ μικρὸν ἔργον γένοιτο. ἐὰν μὲν οὖν ὑμεῖς κελεύητε, περὶ ἐνίων μνησθείην ἂν αὐτῶν· εἰ δέ τισιν ὑμῶν ἀηδὲς ἀκούειν ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ἐμοὶ λέγειν τι περὶ τούτων, αὐτὰς τὰς μαρτυρίας ὑμῖν παρέξομαι τὰς μαρτυρηθείσας ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ δίκῃ, ὧν οὐδεμιᾷ ἐπισκήψασθαι ἠξίωσαν οὗτοι. καίτοι ὅπου κοινὴν αὐτοὶ ὡμολογήκασιν εἶναι τοῦ βουλομένου τὴν γυναῖκα, πῶς ἂν εἰκότως ἡ αὐτὴ γυνὴ ἐγγυητὴ δόξειεν εἶναι;

[…] and in addition, whether anybody else has taken the defendant's sister as his lawfully wedded wife, either any of those who were involved with her before our uncle knew her, or those who had relations with her when he did know her, or those who did so later after his death. After all, her brother has clearly married her in the same way to everybody who has had relations with her. If we had to list these people one by one, it would certainly be no small task. So, if you command it, I'll mention some of them; but if it's as distasteful to some of you to hear about this as it is for me to say anything about it, I'll produce for you the depositions from the previous trial, none of which my opponents saw fit to contest. Yet when they themselves have

[270] For this see Cohen, 2015: 168.

[271] This goes against Herodotus' argument that Greeks, contrary to the Lydians, do not prostitute little girls (τέκνα καταπορνεύουσι). On this, see section 2.4.

admitted that the woman was available to anybody who wanted her, how could one reasonably believe that this same woman was a lawfully wedded wife?[272]

By framing the sister as an hetaira, as she is accused in the depositions (3.14-16), but at the same time a freeborn marriageable woman, under the protection of her brother, the speaker implies that Nicodemus was responsible of making his sister sexually available to many men. In this case it would not be a claim of sexual exploitation of a young girl, since Nicodemus' sister is of marriageable age, however it makes us aware that selling the sexual favours of family members not only happened, but it was recognized as an issue deserving of legal regulation. A law attributed to Solon (Pl. *Sol.* 23), stipulated that a father could not sell his daughter into slavery, and so become sexually exploitable for her master, unless it was proven that she was not a virgin. The existence of this law hints that, as Cohen (2015: 168) states, "the provision of female relatives for paid sexual use was common enough to evoke legislative action seeking to restrict this phenomenon".

One final example deserves to be analysed. In the already mentioned speech by Dinarchus, the speaker mentions that one man, Euthymachus, was sentenced for putting an Olynthian girl in his brothel:

Εὐθύμαχον δέ, διότι τὴν Ὀλυνθίαν παιδίσκην ἔστησεν ἐπ᾽ οἰκήματος

[…] Euthymachus because he put the Olynthian girl in his brothel.[273]

By defining the girl as *paidiskē*, the speaker makes a reference to her young age, however she is clearly not an Athenian, since she is identified as a girl from Olynthus. She might possibly be a refugee, following the conquering of Olynthus by Philip in 348 B.C.E. However, despite her citizenship, Euthymachus was punished as if he had

[272] Tr. Edwards. For a general perception of the speech, see Edwards' introduction.
[273] Tr. Worthington.

committed a crime against an Athenian girl. This case is similar to the one reported by Lysias (13.65), in which one of Agoratus' brother was sentenced to death because he tried to kidnap a young girl (παιδίσκην) and was sentenced to death. It also bears resemblances to the just mentioned law of Solon. Although Euthymachus was not the girl's father, he forces her to become a prostitute in his own brothel. Through forcing a young girl to become sexually exploitable, Euthymachus would benefit. It is, once again, an example of how attractive a young girl (although in this case not clearly a prepubescent girl) would be for potential brothel clients.

2.5. Law

2.5.1. Sexual abuse of prepubescent boys

As we have seen in the last sections, the sources convey that both female and male children could be seen as objects of sexual desire. However, the sources also hint that there were limitations and that those children were off-limits, implying that respecting these limitations would be the norm, and not respecting them the *para*-norm. I have already briefly discussed the law of Solon that forbids the prostituting of the freeborn females under one's protection. I return to this law in this section, where I explore the available legal evidence for the protection of children, starting with male *paides*.

A key text to use to discuss the sexual aspects of a boy's life in ancient Athens is Aeschines' *Against Timarchos.* This speech, generally dated to 346/5 B.C.E., is Aeschines' response to a suit previously moved against him by Timarchus, where Aeschines was accused of misconduct in the negotiations of the peace treaty with Philip of Macedon. In this speech, Aeschines retaliates, seeking to frame Timarchus as unfit to participate in public life. The basis of Aeschines' accusation is the claim that Timarchus

had prostituted himself and wasted his inheritance; both actions punishable with the removal of the citizen's right to address the assembly. Although the factual evidence provided by Aeschines seems to be weak, we know that he won this suit.

Early in the speech, Aeschines conveys a series of laws that regulated the moral conduct of citizens, exposing them in chronological order of the age of individuals. Among the mentioned laws, Aeschines makes reference to a group of laws, supposedly from the time of Solon, which existed to protect boys from ill-intentioned suitors:

Οἱ δὲ τῶν παίδων διδάσκαλοι ἀνοιγέτωσαν μὲν τὰ διδασκαλεῖα μὴ πρότερον ἡλίου ἀνιόντος, κλειέτωσαν δὲ πρὸ ἡλίου δύνοντος. καὶ μὴ ἐξέστω τοῖς ὑπὲρ τὴν τῶν παίδων ἡλικίαν οὖσιν εἰσιέναι τῶν παίδων ἔνδον ὄντων, ἐὰν μὴ υἱὸς διδασκάλου ἢ ἀδελφὸς ἢ θυγατρὸς ἀνήρ· ἐὰν δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτ᾽ εἰσίῃ, θανάτῳ ζημιούσθω. καὶ οἱ γυμνασιάρχαι τοῖς Ἑρμαίοις μὴ ἐάτωσαν συγκαθιέναι μηδένα τῶν ἐν ἡλικίᾳ τρόπῳ μηδενί· ἐὰν δὲ ἐπιτρέπῃ καὶ μὴ ἐξείργῃ τοῦ γυμνασίου, ἔνοχος ἔστω ὁ γυμνασιάρχης τῷ τῆς ἐλευθέρων φθορᾶς νόμῳ. οἱ δὲ χορηγοὶ οἱ καθιστάμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἔστωσαν τὴν ἡλικίαν ὑπὲρ τετταράκοντα ἔτη.

The teachers of the boys shall open the schools not earlier than sunrise, and they shall close them before sunset. It shall not be permitted to any who may be older than the boys to enter when the boys are inside, unless he be a son of the teacher or a brother or a sister's husband. If anyone enters against these regulations, he shall be punished by death. The gymnasiarchs shall not permit under any circumstances anyone who has reached manhood to enter in the contests at the Hermaia; if he permits this and does not exclude them from the gymnasium, he shall be liable to the law concerning the corruption of free males. The choregoi appointed by the people shall have attained an age greater than 40 years.[274]

Despite being attributed to Solon, it is likely that the laws concerning the teachers are of a later period, since they are not attested anywhere else.[275] Nevertheless, it shows the preoccupation that the legislators in Athens had to secure their sons. Considering the school teachers as a liability,[276] especially due the amount of time that they could spend alone with their students, the law seeks to regulate it, stating that the school needs to be open after sunrise and before sunset, meaning that anything that happens in school would happen in daylight. Here I should note that Aeschines' description of this law does not

[274] Tr. Fisher.

[275] Lear, 2015: 121. Fisher (2001: 129; 283-284) argues that the laws on slaves (1.138-40) and on hubris (15-17), that Aeschines also refers to, were certainly Solonian, however it is less certain that Solon ever passed laws on gymnasia or schools.

[276] Fisher (2001: 129) highlights the awareness that Aeschines should have had of legislation that regulated the school teacher's behaviour, due to his own father, Atrometos, being a teacher.

exclude any teacher, therefore younger children, that should start their school life around six or seven, would also be protected. The legislation quoted by Aeschines restricts the number of men that can have access to the school to an easily controllable situation: only the teacher, his son, brother or son-in-law. Since the children in school could only possibly have contact with male adults from the teacher's family, in case of wrongdoing the perpetrator would most likely be traced back to this family, ruining their reputation. The law quoted by Aeschines promulgates that if anyone else enters the school they can be punished with death; however, the veracity of this claim is today disputed.[277]

The law also regulated the contact between older men and children in the gymnasium, and the required age for someone to be a *choregos.*[278] By being older than forty years old, it was expected that the man would have better control over his impulses and not try to seduce the child. Aeschines (1.138-139) also conveys ancestral laws that regulated the contact between children and slaves. A slave could not take part in the gymnasium, nor become the lover, or pursuer, of a free boy, under the penalty of fifty lashes. The prohibition of slaves is also mentioned in the law of Beroea.[279] The text conveying the law opens with a statement that the law is being published, following the example of other cities in Macedonia, engraved on a stele that should be erected in the gymnasium so that young men, *neoteroi*, will feel a greater sense of shame and be more obedient to their leader. The law starts by stating that the appointed *gymnasiarch* should not be under thirty or over sixty years old. There are obvious similarities between this and the law quoted in Aeschines that regulates the suitable age for the *choregos*, and I believe

[277] Cantarella (2002: 34-35) builds a solid case on the inexistence of this penalty: "Apart from mercenary relations […], Athenian law only punished homosexual relationships imposed through violence; moreover, even in that case the sanction was not death, but only a fine. […] The hypothesis that any adult would be put to death merely because he had gone into a school or a gymnasium is thus unthinkable. In all probability, Athenian law confined itself to prohibiting certain particularly undesirable adults from entering those places. This seems to have been the rule in other Greek cities, as the law on schools in Beroea confirms".
[278] This is also referred by Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 56.3). See also Fisher, 2001: 134; and MacDowell (1989).
[279] The law was inscribed on two sides of a stele dated not long before the defeat of Macedonia by the Romans. For a translation see Austin, 2006: text 137.

that the reason should also be the same. Similarly to Aeschines' reference to the prohibition of slaves, in the *gymnasium* in Beroea not only slaves but also ex-slaves (ἀπελεύθεροι) and their sons, *apalaistroi*,[280] prostitutes (*hetaireukotes*), drunkards and mad people were prohibited from attending. The law also regulates nakedness and contact between the boys. No man under thirty should strip without the gymnasiarch's consent (B, 1-3); and none of the *neaniskoi* (young men between the ephebic status and thirty) could in any way have contact with the *paides*, on the risk of paying a fine (B, 14-16).

These are examples of how the legal systems of two different cities recognized the danger to which younger boys were subjected. However, it is most likely that these dangers were recognized by society in general, and so informal means of control must have existed. We find this danger discussed in Plato's *Symposium*. During his speech (1831-183e), Pausanias says that, considering that both the gods and the city's law allows the lover to pursue his desires, loving a boy should be a great honour, however, the fact that fathers put a *paidagōgos* in charge of their sons, with strict instructions to prevent contact with possible suitors, hints at the opposite view, that loving a boy is a disgraceful act. He then concludes that loving a boy is a noble thing when nobly conducted, and a vile thing when vilely pursued. It is fair to assume that in a society that sanctioned a relation between an older man and a boy, within certain boundaries, the family would try to protect their child from unlawful approaches. It is not different from the courting process that lasted until the final decades of the twentieth century, where it was not uncommon for a young lady to be chaperoned. However, not every family in antiquity would be wealthy enough to be able to afford slaves, and especially one slave just to chaperone the child. Nevertheless, similarly to what I have stated in the previous chapter concerning the seclusion of women, the fact that some could not afford it does not mean

[280] It is not certain who were part of this group. Cantarella (2002: 28) argues that *apalaistroi* indicates men who could not physically attend the gymnasium, so either physically impaired or just physically weaker men. See also Fisher, 2001: 131.

that they would not enforce the ideology behind seclusion, or in this case, the contact between an older man and a child.

There seems to be a link between this classical Athenian notion of the need to protect children from potential ill-intentioned suitors and one of the already discussed epigrams by Strato in the second century C.E. In *AP* 12.205, where he speaks of his neighbour's son who constantly teases him despite not being over twelve years old, and so off-limits, the author finishes with a very withering expression:

> […] νῦν ἀφύλακτοι ὄμφακες ἦν δ᾽ ἀκμάσῃ φρούρια καὶ σκόλοπες
>
> Now the unripe grapes are unguarded; when he ripens there will be watchmen and stakes.[281]

Strato embodies the approved social behaviour in that situation which, despite its late date, seems to be the similar to the accepted social behaviour in fourth century B.C.E. Athens. Recognizing that the boy was too young, Strato refuses his attempts to seduce him, although feeling attracted by the boy. However, one question arises from this epigram: at such a young age the boy was unprotected, but when he matures he will need to be guarded. We should consider the reasons why the younger child would not require protection but the older one would. The best explanation that I can muster is that, at a younger age, the boy would not require protection because no man would attempt to court him. We could follow the argument of Pausanias in the *Symposium*, and argue an idealized version of pederasty here, where the suitor should wait for the boy to show some *noos*, that he clearly did not at that point, considering how he was showing himself to be sexually available to the author of the epigram. He was clearly attracted by the sexual advances of the boy, but he was able to control his sexual longings. Could this be a hint at a type of legitimate, legally enforced age of consent? In fact, the explanation that a young, prepubescent boy, according to Strato under twelve, would not need supervision

[281] Tr. Paton.

might hint that no man would try to court him under the threat of legal repercussions and/or violence from the boy's father. This would be different with boys over twelve, who being mature, or in the maturation process, enough to be courted, already required a closer supervision by their father, since he would now be more exposed to the courting attempts of older men.

This brings us to another discussion, namely if the involvement with a prepubescent boy/ under twelve was recognized as a legally punished transgression. David Cohen (1991a: 183) hints that such a law might have existed, or that the law of hubris could be applied to regulate such affairs. When discussing a possible scenario of an Athenian prosecuted for raping an *erōmenos,* Cohen states that the accused would not have much success in his plea if the boy in question was ten years old, although if he was seventeen, despite still being legally a minor, the outcome might be different.[282] Golden (2015: 49-50) disagrees with Cohen, arguing that he bases his argument solely on a few passages where hubris is used as an indication of sexual offences, and that there is not any actual evidence that the law of hubris could, in specific situations, be used as a law of statutory rape.

Cantarella also disagrees with Cohen, stating that there is no evidence for something like statutory rape in ancient Greek law.[283] However, she builds an argument that deserves a proper exploration. Cantarella starts by analysing the law quoted in Lysias (1.32), where the orator states that if anyone defiles a free man or child, he will have to pay a financial penalty. The law refers to *pais*, however it does not make any reference to age, and so, taken literally, everyone involved with a *pais*, that could be a seventeen to

[282] Fisher, 2001: 39 argues something similar: "Prosecutions of one's teenage son's lover where the issue was persuasion by gifts or by money, not rape, would have seemed a very risky procedure. Conviction would be difficult, especially on what was regarded as the very serious charge of *hybris*, and the publicity might well be more likely to increase family shame than to save it. One might, however, suspect (though there is no evidence) that the younger the boy, the greater the likelihood of a stronger desire to prosecute, and a better chance of success."

[283] Lear and Cantarella, 2008: 3-4.; Cantarella, 2002: 42-44.

eighteen-year-old young man, would fall under the scope of this law. Since we know that it was acceptable to be in a relationship with a pubescent boy, this law could not be completely and literally enforced. Cantarella makes a similar analysis of the law of hubris provided by Aeschines and later by Demosthenes, stating that although the law dealt with sexual misbehaviour, its scope was far wider and, once again, there is a reference to child but no reference to the specific age. Cantarella then provides her theory of the stratification of *paides* in three age groups, that I have already mentioned, the first of boys under twelve, and so offlimits (although she adds that, as far as we can know, there were no legal penalties for anybody who did it), the second of *paides* between twelve and fourteen or fifteen, and a third up to eighteen years old.[284] As I have stated, in my opinion, this is the rightful approach to the sources, and possibly the only way to make sense of the dichotomy between the legal and every other text. Although Cantarella starts by disagreeing with Cohen, she ends up building an argument that could enforce the theory of the existence of a law on statutory rape, or at least the law of hubris could be used in this case. If, in fact, both the law on sexual violence quoted by Lysias (1.32) and the law of hubris in Aeschines referred to the entire age range that the term *pais* refers to, that would pose an enormous threat to anyone engaging in pederastic courtship. Since we do know that pederasty was an accepted practice, the law could not possibly refer to all *paides.*

Despite not specifying the age, Aeschines (1.139) does seem to recognize that there were cases where the boy would be too young, and so the question of age of consent would not be considered:[285]

ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τὸν ἐλεύθερον ἐκώλυσεν ἐρᾶν καὶ ὁμιλεῖν καὶ ἀκολουθεῖν, οὐδὲ βλάβην τῷ παιδί, ἀλλὰ μαρτυρίαν σωφροσύνης ἡγήσατο συμβαίνειν. ἀκύρου δ᾽ οἶμαι καὶ ἀδυνάτου ἔτι ὄντος κρῖναι τὸν ὄντως εὔνουν καὶ μή, τὸν ἐρῶντα σωφρονίζει, καὶ τοὺς τῆς φιλίας λόγους εἰς τὴν φρονοῦσαν καὶ πρεσβυτέραν ἡλικίαν ἀναβάλλεται: τὸ δ᾽ ἐπακολουθεῖν καὶ ἐφορᾶν φρουρὰν καὶ φυλακὴν σωφροσύνης ἡγήσατο εἶναι μεγίστην.

[284] Cantarella, 2002: 44.
[285] Cohen 1991a: 183

But he did not prevent the free man from being a lover, from associating with or pursuing a boy, nor did he think that this brought harm to the boy, but saw it as a testimony to his self-control. But, I think, while the boy is not his own master and incapable of judging who is really well-disposed to him and who is not, the lawgiver makes the lover be self-controlled, and makes him defer the words of affection until he has reached an older age and is capable of good sense. But to follow and look after the boy he regards as the greatest guard and protection for the boy's chastity.[286]

According to Aeschines, Solon did not seek to legislate against pederasty, but rather to force the man into self-control until the boy reaches and older age. If the legislator passes a law regulating the contact between young boys and possible lovers, where it is stated the proper behaviour the *erastēs* should have - protecting the chastity of the boy - it seems that the most likely consequence of breaking the law would be a legally enforced punishment.

Immediately following the quotation of the already explored Solonian law (1.12), Aeschines continues to show the consequences for the sexual maltreatment of children (1.13-14):

Μετὰ ταῦτα τοίνυν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, νομοθετεῖ περὶ ἀδικημάτων μεγάλων μέν, γιγνομένων δ᾽ οἶμαι ἐν τῇ πόλει· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πράττεσθαί τιν᾽ ὧν οὐ προσῆκεν, ἐκ τούτου τοὺς νόμους ἔθεντο οἱ παλαιοί. διαρρήδην γοῦν λέγει ὁ νόμος, ἐάν τινα ἐκμισθώσῃ ἑταιρεῖν πατὴρ ἢ ἀδελφὸς ἢ θεῖος ἢ ἐπίτροπος ἢ ὅλως τῶν κυρίων τις, κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ μὲν τοῦ παιδὸς οὐκ ἐᾷ γραφὴν εἶναι, κατὰ δὲ τοῦ μισθώσαντος καὶ τοῦ μισθωσαμένου, τοῦ μὲν ὅτι ἐξεμίσθωσε, τοῦ δὲ ὅτι, φησίν, ἐμισθώσατο. καὶ ἴσα τὰ ἐπιτίμια ἑκατέρῳ πεποίηκε, καὶ μὴ ἐπάναγκες εἶναι τῷ παιδὶ ἡβήσαντι τρέφειν τὸν πατέρα μηδὲ οἴκησιν παρέχειν, ὃς ἂν ἐκμισθωθῇ ἑταιρεῖν· ἀποθανόντα δὲ θαπτέτω καὶ τἆλλα ποιείτω τὰ νομιζόμενα.

Next, then, men of Athens, he lays down laws to cover offences which, great as they are, are still, I believe, actually committed in the city. It was, after all, because improper acts were performed that the ancients passed their laws. The law states explicitly: if anyone hires a boy out to be an escort (*hetaireîn*), whether the hirer is the father, the brother, the uncle, the guardian, or finally anyone who has authority over him, the law does not permit an indictment against the boy himself, but against the man who put him out to hire and against the man who hired him, against the former because he put him out for hire, and against the latter, it says, because he hired him. The law makes the penalties the same for both, and adds that there is no necessity for a boy, when he has grown up, to support his father or provide him with a home, if that father has hired him out to be an escort; he must, however, bury his father at his death, and perform the customary rites.

[286] Translated by Fisher.

This legislation attributed to Solon shows that there was an awareness of the sexual allurement of young boys in the society of the time, and it was deemed necessary not only to pass laws that envisaged the regulation of sexual contact between boys and older men, but also to stop anyone from making a profit out of it. Considering that pederastic love was practised in Athens, it seems obvious that there could exist a niche in the prostitution market where selling the favours of a boy would generate considerable income, even more considering the risk of doing it when the law expressly forbids it. To my knowledge, this Solonian law seems to have attained its goal since we do not have any known case where a boy was sold by his father or an immediate family member, however if there is a law against it the most likely possibility is that it happened at some point. Aeschines himself admits that it was "because improper acts were performed that the ancients passed their laws". After the law on prostitution of boys, Aeschines adds another law against procuring, *proagōgeia*, for which the perpetrator would be punished with the heaviest penalty.[287] We should consider whether any of this is proof that in ancient Athens there was something like a modern law of statutory rape. Dover (1978: 36) seems to have considered this, however without presenting any palpable conclusions.[288] The only scholar that I have found advancing such a possibility was Cohen, and even he did not build much on it.[289] Fisher (2001: 36-40) agrees that there

[287] Fisher (2001: 138) argues that the penalty for both *hetairesis* and *proagōgeia* would be, like the *graphe* of *hubris*, open to assessment, *timesis*.

[288] In his words: "[…] It may therefore be the case that unwilling homosexual submission was held to be the product of dishonest enticement, threats, blackmail, the collaboration of accomplices, or some other means which indicated premeditation, precluded the excuse of irresistible excitement, and automatically put the aggressor in danger of indictment for hubris".

[289] Davidson (2007: 184), argues that if any Athenian was caught assaulting a boy under eighteen he could be punished with death in the same day. The only elaboration that the author offers on this affirmation is a footnote referencing Aeschines 1.7-8, that does not refer directly to any of the laws that the orator quotes, and a reference to Cohen (1991: 222), where he mentions the laws meant to protect young boys that Aeschines quotes, and the punishment of death under the law of hubris for the molester. Despite Davidson clearly stating that he believes that the law of hubris would deal with sexual assault on boys outside the age limits for consenting a pederastic relationship, he is considering boys under eighteen in general. This being so, the law of hubris would be completely applicable, since it only mentions *pais*, without providing any indication of the specific age, and as we have already seen the term *pais* could include boys until eighteen. However, as was already pointed out, I believe, as most, if not all, scholarship on the subject, that

should have been "issues of parental or legal protection for boys who were not yet of an age to be responsible for their own decisions", but when commentating on Cohen's theory he states that evidence is lacking to support such a claim.

The topic requires a high degree of caution. Basing ourselves solely on our knowledge of the Athenian penal code, we do not have enough evidence to conclude that there was a law specifically concerning the sexual abuse of children. We are not aware of any accusation of the sort being taken to court. The laws quoted by Lysias and Aeschines do mention the punishment on the defilement of *paides* (αἰσχύνη βίας) or whom suffered hubris, failed to specify the age, or maturation, of the child. With the latter, there is the aggravation of hubris covering much more than sexual offences. In the *Symposium* (181C-2A), Pausanias states that there should be a law against falling in love with *paides* before they show the first signs of beard:

[…] ὑπὸ τούτου τοῦ ἔρωτος ὡρμημένους: οὐ γὰρ ἐρῶσι παίδων, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπειδὰν ἤδη ἄρχωνται νοῦν ἴσχειν, τοῦτο δὲ πλησιάζει τῷ γενειάσκειν. παρεσκευασμένοι γὰρ οἶμαί εἰσιν οἱ ἐντεῦθεν ἀρχόμενοι ἐρᾶν ὡς τὸν βίον ἅπαντα συνεσόμενοι καὶ κοινῇ συμβιωσόμενοι, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐξαπατήσαντες, ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ λαβόντες ὡς νέον, καταγελάσαντες οἰχήσεσθαι ἐπ᾽ ἄλλον ἀποτρέχοντες. χρῆν δὲ καὶ νόμον εἶναι μὴ ἐρᾶν παίδων, ἵνα μὴ εἰς ἄδηλον πολλὴ σπουδὴ ἀνηλίσκετο: τὸ γὰρ τῶν παίδων τέλος ἄδηλον οἷ τελευτᾷ κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς ψυχῆς τε πέρι καὶ σώματος. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀγαθοὶ τὸν νόμον τοῦτον αὐτοὶ αὑτοῖς ἑκόντες τίθενται, χρῆν δὲ καὶ τούτους τοὺς πανδήμους ἐραστὰς προσαναγκάζειν τὸ τοιοῦτον, ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ἐλευθέρων γυναικῶν προσαναγκάζομεν αὐτοὺς καθ᾽ ὅσον δυνάμεθα μὴ ἐρᾶν.

[…] they love boys only when they begin to acquire some mind—a growth associated with that of down on their chins. For I conceive that those who begin to love them at this age are prepared to be always with them and share all with them as long as life shall last: they will not take advantage of a boy's green thoughtlessness to deceive him and make a mock of him by running straight off to another. Against this love of boys a law should have been enacted, to prevent the sad waste of attentions paid to an object so uncertain: for who can tell where a boy will end at last, vicious or virtuous in body and soul? Good men, however, voluntarily make this law for themselves, and it is a rule which those 'popular' lovers ought to be forced to obey, just as we force them, so far as we can, to refrain from loving our freeborn women.[290]

Davidson (2007: 80-84), quotes this passage, building on his argument that, due to the supposed late puberty in antiquity, if a man should only love a boy when he

Davidson's assessment of the age of the *erōmenos* is wrong, and so the point that I am making concerning the law of hubris is different from the one he made.

[290] Tr. Fowler.

develops the first facial hair, that boy would certainly be around eighteen years old. However, Golden (1990: 58-62), Fisher (2001: 38), Cantarella (2002: 36-44), Laes (2010: 46) and Lear (2014: 120-121) are right when they note that Pausanias' phrase indeed implies the contrary, showing that there was no law forbidding relationships with younger boys. Davidson's argument, that when Pausanias refers to naïve boys he means any boy under eighteen, is, in my view, indefensible. He chooses to support the notion that puberty in antiquity started much later than today, based on eighteenth-nineteenth century evidence, while completely ignoring the accounts of ancient evidence such as the works of Aristotle or Galen that clearly state that puberty started around fourteen. Despite Pausanias' reference to the lack of a law that punished men who took advantage of very young boys, we cannot deny that, when we piece all the sources together, there certainly are defined boundaries that set what is a correct way to love a *pais* and what transgresses it. We are aware of laws that were promulgated to protect children, to ensure they did not enter a pederastic relationship while being too young and so unable to discern between a good and bad suitor. There is no sense in passing laws protecting the chastity of the boy, if in the eventuality of them being transgressed the culprit does not suffer a punishment that could be either a financial fine or eventually death.

There is one other aspect of the mention of the law of hubris in Aeschines that I do not think has been explored as it should. The quotation of the law is a sort of conclusion of his discussion on the legislation meant to protect children.[291] He starts by mentioning the laws that were promulgated under Solon (10), that limited the access that teachers had to boys, as well as the contact between boys of different ages, their contact with slaves and the *choregus*; then moving to the laws against prostituting a boy and the crime of procuring, and only at that point does he mention the law of hubris. He builds his

[291] Independently of the quotation of the law being a later fabrication or not, as Hubbard (2009) and Fisher (2001: 139-140) contend, the commentary following the quotation (15), an explanation of the law, is undoubtedly from Aeschines himself.

argument by presenting these laws based on a sense of ever-increasing aggravation. He certainly mentions *pais* without giving an exact age, however it becomes clear that he is speaking of children that were not old enough to be in a pederastic relationship.[292] Later in the speech (139), he reprises the discussion on Solonian legislation, and specifically says that those laws were meant to force the adult to restrain his desires, making "him defer the words of affection until he has reached an older age and is capable of good sense". Aeschines is clearly mentioning prepubescent children, boys possibly under twelve, when he brings up the law of hubris, referencing the law as a regulation for sexual violation.[293] And why would he discuss it if it could not positively add to the point he was trying to make? In referring to this law in the sequence of the arguments that he was presenting, it would be clear to the jurors the sort of *pais* that he was mentioning.

Therefore, there is a high possibility that a case of sexual abuse of a freeborn boy could be judged under the spectrum of the law of hubris. The case against Timarchos should have been brought around 346/345 B.C.E., only a few years later than Plato's *Laws*, where the following is stated (874c):

καὶ ἐὰν ἐλευθέραν γυναῖκα βιάζηταί τις ἢ παῖδα περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια, νηποινὶ τεθνάτω ὑπό τε τοῦ ὑβρισθέντος βίᾳ καὶ ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἢ ἀδελφῶν ἢ υἱέων

The man who forcibly violates a free woman or boy shall be slain with impunity by the person thus violently outraged, or by his father or brother or sons.[294]

In Plato's text, the punishment for the sexual abuse of a child is clear: whoever resources to strength and physically violates (βιάζηται … τἄ ἀφροδισία) a child, shall be killed by the person who was outraged (ὑβρισθέντος), or by their closest male relative. As already noted, Plato's *Laws* is a philosophical dialogue and therefore considering it

[292] Fisher (2011: 140) also points out that when mentioning the law of hubris, Aeschines is mentioning children.
[293] MacDowell (1976: 25) also argues that when Aeschines quoted the law of hubris he was clearly concerned with sexual violation.
[294] Tr. Bury.

when discussing the application of actual laws in fourth century B.C.E. Athens requires a great degree of caution. In the text, the characters do not discuss legislation that should be or was used in Athens, but rather the laws and procedures that should be enforced in Magnesia. However, it is still a discussion of the application of legislation in the work of an Athenian man. The character proposing the legislation is the Athenian, further enforcing this connection. The proposed legislation, especially the reference to boys, does not fall outside of the perspective provided in the *Symposium*, where the proper way to seduce a boy is discussed by Athenian characters, and where ill-intentioned suitors are criticized. Therefore, there is a connection between the legislation discussed in the *Laws*, by the Athenian character, with the ideology discussed in the *Symposium*, by Athenian characters, and the legal context for hubris against a boy in the *Laws* is essentially the same as that assumed by Aeschines, who lived roughly at the same time as Plato. Once again, the act of hubris and the sexual abuse of children are connected. Basing myself in the available evidence, I propose that sexual abuse of children would be covered by law, at least in Athens, and although we do not know what the law was, or if there was one law for it, it is highly likely that such case could be brought under the law of hubris. In a society that in so many ways idealized boy love, it is only right that they punished anyone who would give the practice a bad name.

However, neither the law of hubris nor any other description of possible consequences to a child abuser predicts a scenario where the child is abused by a member of their family. It is safe to assume that a situation such as this would never see the light of day. Children do not have an audible voice among adults, it would be extremely complicated for someone inside the *oikos* to accuse one of its members of sexually abusing a son or daughter, and even when considering an outsider culprit, the shame and social repercussions that the family and the victim would suffer would most likely restrain the will to seek justice. Aristotle (*Rh.* 1373a) seems to have considered this:

καὶ ὅσα αἰσχύνονται οἱ ἀδικηθέντες λέγειν, οἷον γυναικῶν οἰκείων ὕβρεις ἢ εἰς αὐτοὺς ἢ εἰς υἱεῖς

Or they [men] commit wrongs which the victims are ashamed to disclose, such as outrages upon the women of their family, upon themselves, or upon their children.[295]

Aristotle implies that when the wife or the children of one man are the victims of hubris, perpetrated by their own husband/ father, they could feel so ashamed that they would not bring the transgression to public. This type of sexual abuse is indeed one of the most common today. Radford (2011) estimates that, in the UK alone, one in five children has been exposed to some sort of domestic abuse, including sexual abuse and rape. There is, however, no possible means of attempting to assess this in ancient Greece, and obviously we cannot rely on modern statistics on the subject. However, having no data on possible occurrences of domestic abuse does not mean that we cannot suppose what might indeed happen to the abuser, which is, most likely, nothing. As I said, children have no voice, and within the household the father was the sole retainer of the legal power. It would be virtually impossible to bring a case against a man for sexually abusing his son. The most likely witnesses would be the members of his household – close family such as the wife/ mother, other siblings and slaves – which were all under the father's power and therefore providing a testimony against him would certainly result in personal grievance. If the abuser was, for example, an uncle, the case would still, most likely, never come to light. Unless he was caught *in flagrante delicto*, first it would be necessary for the boy to speak up and for the father to take him seriously. Even if this occurred, the father would most likely still not legally move against the abuser, since public knowledge of this situation would certainly affect the family's name and the child's future. If the child was violated by one of the household slaves, the case would be different. There would be no reason to pursue a legal avenue, since the father would have the power to punish the slave in almost any way he deemed fit.

[295] Tr. Freese.

Therefore, despite the clear (possibly legal) limits and social emphasis on protection of boys, there was no means in ancient Greece to protect the child from abuse by a family member. An act similar to what we would today deem incestuous child sexual abuse (with emphasis on 'similar' and 'today') might have occurred in ancient Greece, as we might deduce from Aristotle's words, however, no state mechanism would seek to swiftly provide access to justice for the child. The power lay in the hands of the father, and he would be the one entitled to move for legal repercussions, however it is extremely unlikely that this would ever happen, either because the father himself could be the abuser or simply considering the amount of shame that public disclosure of this occurrence would bring to the family's name.

2.5.2. Sexual abuse of prepubescent girls

Similarly, to what we have seen in the case of boys, although with less available evidence, little girls could also be objects of sexual desire in ancient Greece. Gaca (2014) summed up what we can ascertain from the sources as follows`:

> Thus, to the extent that male-authored Greek poems regard girl παῖδες and still underdeveloped παρθένοι as sex objects, take their lack of familial protection for granted, and convey a sexually experienced familiarity with the unripe bodies of underage girls, the poems disclose the trajectory of heterosexual pedophilia as enacted, and not only fantasized, by adult men. Even though poems are not true-life diaries, they are major repositories of the social norms that inform sexual practices in times past and present.

In the case of freeborn girls, the capital punishment of the culprit could be sanctioned under the law of lawful homicide. The law dictates that a man who catches another man on top of his wife, mother, sister, daughter or concubine (Dem. 23.53-4) has the right to kill him, without suffering future legal consequences. By encompassing daughters (θυγατρί), the law covers female children. However, this law does not directly protect girls or punish sexual abusers, it just exculpates the *kurios* if he murdered the

culprit, within the boundaries of the law. It also would not cover a rape of a girl that was not caught *in flagrante delicto*. That could be covered, as was just argued for boys, by the law of hubris. Both the law quoted by Aeschines and Plato's reference to the consequences of hubris use the term *paides*, which as we have seen can apply to both boys and girls, and even slaves.[296] Although Aeschines cites this law in a discussion concerning the protection of boys, the law would equally cover girls, as it covered every other class of freeborn citizen (both *andres* and *gynaikes*) and even slaves.

Contrary to what we have seen for male children, we do not have any evidence of laws specifically meant to protect female children, which should not come as a surprise when we consider that in Athens there was a social and legally accepted sexual practice between boys and adults, contrary to girls; and the number of sources who discuss it, as opposedto the discussion of the sexuality of female *paides*, which is almost inexistent. This does not mean that a case of sexual abuse of a boy would be a more serious affair than the sexual abuse of a girl. Both would be considered terrible affronts to the personal honour of those children that would eventually grow to play their role in society, and to the honour of their father and their household. The bigger concern in protecting male children from potential abuse starts from the principle that they would generally enjoy more freedom that female children, and so they would be more exposed to danger.

2.5.3. Sexual abuse of prepubescent slaves

Despite not being of free status, at least in theory slaves would be somewhat protected from extreme acts of violence, either by law or religion. The altar of the Eumenides in Athens was a slave protecting space, where they would be safe from the

[296] παῖδες, ἄνδρες, γυναῖκες and δοῦλοι.

physical abuses of their master, until sold to a new one.[297] They would also be protected from murder (Ant. 5.47), although, as Kamen (2013: 12n29) noted, since "only relatives or the owner of the deceased could bring a murder charge (*dike phonou*) (Dem. 47.70), and since slaves could not initiate suits and a master was extremely unlikely to incriminate himself, such cases were likely never brought to court". No law would stipulate a limit for the sexual use of child slaves by their master. They could run away and take refuge in places such as the Eumenides' altar, however, that attitude would not provide freedom to the slave, and he would end up being sold to another, potentially harder, master. When speaking of sexual use of slave children, we do not even know if slaves themselves considered it to be an act of extreme violence.

Therefore, there was no specific legislation that regulated the sexual contact that a master could have with their slaves, either adults or children. In *Gorgias* (483a-483b), Callicles states that slaves would be better dead, since they have no power to defend themselves when they are harmed or insulted. There was, however, legislation that punished anyone who harmed another man's slave. In such a situation, the master could bring a private suit for damages (βλάβη) on his property. As we have seen, the law of hubris also addressed slaves, which means that theoretically any citizen could bring a *graphē hybreōs* (γραφή ὕβρεως) against anyone who committed an act of hubris against a slave. The inclusion of slaves in the law of hubris has puzzled scholars for a long time,[298] since it implies an attack on the slave's honour, a concept by itself complicated to pin down. Kamen (2013: 12-13), summing up different perspectives from different scholars, defines three hypotheses for how the law on hubris could worked in relation to slaves:

> Was it that slaves were protected *qua* vehicles of their master' honor? Was it that they themselves possessed some small degree of honor, *qua* human beings? Was it that the protections offered by the hubris law were simply a by-product of the burgeoning ideology of Athenian democratic inclusiveness?

[297] Kamen, 2013: 12. Ari. *Kn.* 1311-12.
[298] For a brief discussion see Kamen, 2013: 12-14.

She proceeds to argue that, theoretically, if a slave could be protected by this suit at least during that period he would be considered to have a certain degree of honour. McGinn (2014: 87-88) argues that the inclusion of slaves within the spectrum of the law of hubris was a way to protect the masters as a class, protecting the group against the actions of some individuals who might, in this situation, be maltreaters of slaves. For the Athenians, it serves as a moral justification to be slave-owners, since, by including slaves in the law of hubris, they can state that they treat them somewhat democratically, by legally ensuring that they had the right to protection.

Based on the surviving evidence it is not possible to conclude how the law of hubris would protect slaves. On the sexual use of slaves, both adult and children, the evidence points to the fact that they were at the disposal of their master, and of everyone else the master allowed access to. There most likely was a market for male and female child slave prostitutes, and so anyone able to pay could have access to a child without suffering any repercussions. There were, however, limitations to what a client could do to a slave, since they belonged to someone else. A client should not damage the child, or he would be liable to prosecution for damaging another's personal propriety. Therefore, although child slaves could be prostituted, violent sexual acts that might inflict temporary or permanent damage on the body of the child should be avoided, under threat of prosecution.

2.6. Psychological repercussions

When speaking of the psychological repercussions of child sexual abuse in ancient Greece, I believe that it is fair to assume that the true extent of such repercussions is not conveyed by the sources. The available evidence tells us that although the sexual abuse

of children was recognized and possibly punished in ancient Athens, those cases would most likely never come to light. To publicly assume that a child, either boy or girl, was sexually used by a man would result in permanent damage to that child's reputation, and by inference to their family. As mentioned in point 3.2.3., Marcellinus, the second century C.E. doctor, writes about how young girls and even grown women get terrified by the prospect of being examined by a man. When we consider some of the accounts that were explored in this chapter, especially the ones coming from wartime scenarios, where girls and boys would be at the disposal of the conquering soldier, we can only assume that the level of fear and anxiety could only be worse than being inspected by a doctor. We are aware of the wartime rape of children, as Diodorus (13.57-58) and Isocrates (9. 8-10) convey, but we do not have any method to evaluate the psychological repercussions that the children subjected to such extreme violence might have suffered, and no way to tell how being free one day and becoming a sexually exploitable slave the next would affect the mind of a child. Modern studies have approached this issue in general, more specifically the psychological repercussions of massive, continued rape in warfare scenarios, such as in ex-Yugoslavia, where it is estimated that more than 20,000 girls, women and men were raped.[299] However, although several of these studies do include children, none of them focuses solely on children and the effects of wartime sexual abuse on them.

These are some of the limitations that a psychological approach to sexual abuse of children in antiquity faces. There is, nonetheless, one example that I believe needs to

[299] For this see Buss, 1998; Haddad, 2011; Delic, Hasanovic, Avdibegovic et al., 2014, and Hasanović, 2017. For general health outcomes of sexual violence in war zones from 1984 to 2014 see Ba, Bhopal, 2017. For an analysis of rape victims from WWII see Kuwert, Glaesmer, Eichhorn, et al., 2014. Other studies do focus specifically on the psychological consequences of sexual abuse of children, although not among communities ravaged by war. Wilson, Widom, 2014, analysed the connections between child sexual abuse and future same-sex sexual inclinations. Tomori, McFall, Srikrishnan, et al., 2016, focus on the impact of child sexual abuse on men who have sex with men in India.

be properly explored. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1148b), one of his three moral treaties, Aristotle makes the following remark:

ἐπεὶ δ᾽ ἐστὶν ἔνια μὲν ἡδέα φύσει, καὶ τούτων τὰ μὲν ἁπλῶς τὰ δὲ κατὰ γένη καὶ ζῴων καὶ ἀνθρώπων, τὰ δ᾽ οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν διὰ πηρώσεις τὰ δὲ δι᾽ ἔθη γίνεται, τὰ δὲ διὰ μοχθηρὰς φύσεις, ἔστι καὶ περὶ τούτων ἕκαστα παραπλησίας ἰδεῖν ἕξεις: λέγω δὲ τὰς θηριώδεις, οἷον τὴν ἄνθρωπον ἣν λέγουσι τὰς κυούσας ἀνασχίζουσαν τὰ παιδία κατεσθίειν, ἢ οἷοις χαίρειν φασὶν ἐνίους τῶν ἀπηγριωμένων περὶ τὸν Πόντον, τοὺς μὲν ὠμοῖς τοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπων κρέασιν, τοὺς δὲ τὰ παιδία δανείζειν ἀλλήλοις εἰς εὐωχίαν, ἢ τὸ περὶ Φάλαριν λεγόμενον. αὗται μὲν θηριώδεις, αἱ δὲ διὰ νόσους γίνονται （καὶ διὰ μανίαν ἐνίοις, ὥσπερ ὁ τὴν μητέρα καθιερεύσας καὶ φαγών, καὶ ὁ τοῦ συνδούλου τὸ ἧπαρ） αἱ δὲ νοσηματώδεις ἢ ἐξ ἔθους, οἷον τριχῶν τίλσεις καὶ ὀνύχων τρώξεις, ἔτι δ᾽ ἀνθράκων καὶ γῆς, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἡ τῶν ἀφροδισίων τοῖς ἄρρεσιν: τοῖς μὲν γὰρ φύσει τοῖς δ᾽ ἐξ ἔθους συμβαίνουσιν, οἷον τοῖς ὑβριζομένοις ἐκ παίδων.

Some things are naturally pleasant, and of these some are unqualifiedly pleasant, others in relation to classes of animals and human beings. Other things are not naturally pleasant, but some of them become so because of a disability, one's habits, or a wicked nature; and we can see similar states concerned with each of these things. By brutish states I mean, for example, the female human who people say rips open pregnant women and devours their babies; or the pleasures of some of the savages that live around the Black Sea, who are alleged to eat raw flesh, or human flesh, or to lend their children to one another to feast upon; or the story of Phalaris. These states are brutish, but others develop through disease, and in some cases madness, as in the case of the person who sacrificed and ate his mother, or the one who ate the liver of his fellow slave. There are others that arise from diseased states or habit, such as pulling out one's hair, nibbling one's nails, or even charcoal or earth, and sex between males. too. These occur naturally in some people, and in others from habit, as in the case of those who have been sexually abused since childhood.[300]

The text conveys a discussion of pleasure, but Aristotle establishes a distinction between pleasures that are naturally pleasant, such as victory and honour, and others that do not derive from natural disposition, but instead are the result of disease, madness or habit. On sexual activities between men, Aristotle seems to imply that it could be either a pleasure that develops naturally or because of habit, particularly in men that were sexually abused since childhood (ὑβριζομένοις ἐκ παίδων). The expression literally refers to men who were subjected to hubris since the time they were a child, and I do believe that 'sexually abused since childhood' is an apt translation. Most of the translations of this text that I have consulted do translate "*hybrizomenois ek paidōn*" like this.[301] Natali

[300] Tr. Crisp slightly adapted.

[301] Most of the translations of this text that I have consulted do translate *hybrizomenois ek paidōn* like this. In Rackham's translation (1934), he understands that the line should be read "those who have been abused from childhood". Irwin (1999: 106-107) translates as "those who have suffered wanton [sexual] assault since their childhood". Broadie and Rowe (2002: 196) translate as "those who are abused from childhood on". Cantarella (2002: 68) translates as "those who have been sexually abused from their childhood years".

(2009: 109-110) chose to translate the expression as "those who get used to it from childhood", negating the negative meaning carried by *hybrizomenois*. He justifies this option by stressing that translating this line by emphasising sexual violence could mislead the reader into thinking that Aristotle could be referring to pederasty, which Aristotle certainly is not.[302] Natali's justification is not valid, since the text never mentions pederasty, and in fact his translation, by implying a non-violent sexual use since childhood, is much more likely to mislead the reader into thinking that it is in fact a reference to pederasty.[303]

This remark is the conclusion of Aristotle's initial discussion on why some activities that are unpleasant become pleasant, either by disease, madness or habit. One of those activities that might develop through habit is sex between two males, which Aristotle lists alongside pulling out one's hair or nibbling one's nails. Although a fondness for these activities might be natural, it can also be the result of habit. The author concludes this initial approach by specifically mentioning one type of activity that might influence a man to have a sexual interest in other men, and that is being sexually abused as a child. Aristotle is indeed implying that boys who are sexually molested in a systematic manner might develop an appreciation for male-to-male sex when they grow up. There is the acknowledgment of a potential psychological repercussion on the child that might reflect in his future behaviour as an adult. Aristotle is referring to adults who take a passive role in sexual intercourse, who are used, clearly implied by mentioning boys who are abused, and so they would not get used to playing the active role in sexual

---

Caeiro (2006: 163) translates as "como acontece com aqueles que foram abusados desde a infância". Reeve (2014: 121) translates as "those who have suffered wanton aggression from childhood on". See also Reeve's explanation for this specific translation in footnote 537: "[…] The reference is probably to sexual aggression, in particular, and is intended to explain why some men engage in sexual intercourse with other men".

[302] Natali concludes his thoughts on this by wondering "whether in the editors' choice there is some trace of nineteenth-century homophobia".

[303] Cohen (1991: 180), although not providing his own translation of the passage, argues that Aristotle clearly did not imply that those boys acquired the habit of being passive because they were raped.

intercourse. Moreover, in the following lines Aristotle proceeds to explain that men who go through this, who get used to be used as a passive partner, either because of habit or a natural predisposition, are not to blame, like women are also not to be blamed for being the passive partner in sexual intercourse with their male partners.

The problematics of being branded as a man who finds pleasure in being sexually used like a woman, the contrary to what a man should be, could bring considerable consequences to a man's reputation and how he was addressed by his peers. This figure is sometimes referred to as *kinaidos* (κίναιδος), a complicated term to translate, in its complete meaning, into English. In *Against Timarchos*, Demosthenes' *kinaidia* is emphasised by Aeschines:

ἐπεὶ καὶ περὶ τῆς Δημοσθένους ἐπωνυμίας, οὐ κακῶς ὑπὸ τῆς φήμης, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ὑπὸ τῆς τίτθης, Βάταλος προσαγορεύεται, ἐξ ἀνανδρίας καὶ κιναιδίας ἐνεγκάμενος τοὔνομα. εἰ γάρ τίς σου τὰ κομψὰ ταῦτα χλανίσκια περιελόμενος καὶ τοὺς μαλακοὺς χιτωνίσκους, ἐν οἷς τοὺς κατὰ τῶν φίλων λόγους γράφεις, περιενέγκας δοίη εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν δικαστῶν, οἶμαι ἂν αὐτούς, εἴ τις μὴ προειπὼν τοῦτο ποιήσειεν, ἀπορῆσαι εἴτε ἀνδρὸς εἴτε γυναικὸς εἰλήφασιν ἐσθῆτα.

Similarly, in the case of Demosthenes' nickname, he is called Batalos, not wrongly, by report, not by his nurse; he has brought the name on himself for his effeminacy and his deviance. If someone were to take off you those fancy little cloaks and those delicate little tunics, which you wear when you are writing your speeches against your friends, and were to pass them around and give them to the jurymen, I think that they would be quite uncertain, if someone had not told them in advance when doing this, whether they were handling the clothes of a man or of a woman.[304]

Aeschines is not directly accusing Demosthenes of being a man who finds pleasure in being used for sex (though this might be implied), but rather his deviance, his *kinaidia*, is Demosthenes' usage of fancy clothes, of delicate fabrics, that would be common among women but not among men.[305] A similar accusation is made again in Aeschines' *On the Embassy* (2.99):

[304] Tr. Fisher. Fisher translates *kinaidia* as "deviance", which I believe is an elegant solution, although it does not convey the full meaning that the term would have had in ancient Greece. Carey chose to translate it by "pathic ways", which I do not believe to be a good solution.

[305] Aeschines (2.150-1) later emphasises the deviancy of Demosthenes, especially when compared with a man who is considered an example of a proper citizen, who embodies the values of the hoplite. This passage, where the dichotomy between hoplite and kinaidos is made clear, is a fundamental part of Winkler's (1990:

συνηκολούθουν δ᾽ αὐτῷ ἄνθρωποι δύο στρωματόδεσμα φέροντες: ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ τούτων, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔφη, τάλαντον ἐνῆν ἀργυρίου. ὥστε τοὺς συμπρέσβεις ἀναμιμνῄσκεσθαι τὰς ἀρχαίας ἐπωνυμίας αὐτοῦ: ἐν παισὶ μὲν γὰρ ὢν ἐκλήθη δι᾽ αἰσχρουργίαν τινὰ καὶ κιναιδίαν Βάταλος […]

He had two attendants who each carried a bundle of bedding, and in one of them, he claimed, was a silver talent. This reminded our colleagues of his old nicknames. As a child he was known as Batalus for a certain readiness for humiliation and perversion.[306]

Once again, Aeschines not only mentions Demosthenes' *kinaidia*, but also his nickname, *Batalos* (Βάταλος). In the first accusation, it is said that *Batalos* was reported to be a nickname given to Demosthenes as a child, which would most likely imply a name with an innocent meaning, however Aeschines says that story is false, that the nickname was not given by the nurse, and since it is used in Aeschines' accusations against Demosthenes it would, most likely, be considered an offensive term. In his speech *On the Crown* (18.180), Demosthenes addresses his nickname *Battalos* (Βάτταλος), using two 't's (τ), meaning 'stammerer', which seems already a good enough jibe against a man who was famous for his public speaking skills. However, Aeschines said *Batalos*, with just one 't' (τ), which would carry the same meaning as *prōktos* (πρωκτός), 'anus' or 'arse'. It is a clever pun designed by Demosthenes' enemies. In his biography of Demosthenes, Plutarch (*Dem.* 4.4) provides several explanations of the term: he starts by saying that the nickname was given to Demosthenes by boys who mocked his lean figure, then adds that *Batalos* was also the name of an effeminate flute-player (αὐλητὴς τῶν κατεαγότων) and even that, at the time in Athens, *Batalos* could be used to refer to body parts that where not decent to name.[307] In this particular situation, by highlighting that Demosthenes' *kinaidia* is why he is known as *Batalos*, Aeschines is painting a vivid picture of a perverted person whose primary source of personal and public identification, his name, is connected to his anus. Obviously that we cannot take Aeschines' affirmations

47) famous theory of "Hoplites vs Kinaidoi", that was more recently approached by Ormand (2009: 49-51) in his subchapter "Hoplites and Kinaidoi".

[306] Tr. Carey.

[307] See also Carey (2000: 138).

at face value and conclude that Demosthenes was an effeminate man who in some way derived pleasure from his bottom, but it is enough to perceive what was the conception of a *kinaidos* in fourth-century B.C.E. Athens.

Kinaidia is approached in other sources as well. In Plato's *Gorgias* (490-494e), Socrates debates with Callicles whether a man should or should not be moderate in the pursuit of his desires. Callicles states that a man should pursue his desires with no limitations, should drink whenever he is thirsty, eat whenever he is hungry, and pursue all other desires he has, in order to achieve a happy life. Facing this theory, Socrates questions Callicles:

[…] καὶ πρῶτον μὲν εἰπὲ εἰ καὶ ψωρῶντα καὶ κνησιῶντα, ἀφθόνως ἔχοντα τοῦ κνῆσθαι, κνώμενον διατελοῦντα τὸν βίον εὐδαιμόνως ἔστι ζῆν.

First of all, tell me whether a man who has an itch and wants to scratch, and may scratch in all freedom, can pass his life happily in continual scratching.[308]

Callicles replies that, in such situation, a man should be able to scratch himself as much as he wants, and that would be the road to his personal happiness. To which Socrates replies:

πότερον εἰ τὴν κεφαλὴν μόνον κνησιῷ—ἢ ἔτι τί σε ἐρωτῶ; ὅρα, ὦ Καλλίκλεις, τί ἀποκρινῇ, ἐάν τίς σε τὰ ἐχόμενα τούτοις ἐφεξῆς ἅπαντα ἐρωτᾷ. καὶ τούτων τοιούτων ὄντων κεφάλαιον, ὁ τῶν κιναίδων βίος, οὗτος οὐ δεινὸς καὶ αἰσχρὸς καὶ ἄθλιος; ἢ τούτους τολμήσεις λέγειν εὐδαίμονας εἶναι, ἐὰν ἀφθόνως ἔχωσιν ὧν δέονται;

Is it so if he only wants to scratch his head? Or what more am I to ask you? See, Callicles, what your answer will be, if you are asked everything in succession that links on to that statement; and the culmination of the case, as stated—the life of *kínaidoi* —is not that awful, shameful, and wretched? Or will you dare to assert that these are happy if they can freely indulge their wants?[309]

Socrates very ingeniously outsmarts Callicles, by contrasting his arguments on pursuing life's pleasures unreservedly, with the *kinaidos*, the ultimate example of a man

[308] Tr. Lamb.
[309] I have followed Lamb's translation except for the translation of *kinaidōn bios*, which he translates as "catamite". Since I do not think that term is the best alternative to capture the meaning of the expression, I have preferred to maintain the original Greek term.

that follows his desires, his lewd unnatural cravings, without any regards, becoming the antithesis of what a man is supposed to be.

A much later epigram, entitled *Eis kinaidous* (*A.P.* 11.272), by an anonymous author, characterizes a *kinaidos* as someone who is neither a man nor a woman. For the author of the epigram, *kinaidos* is a woman contained within the physical form of a man:

Ἀνέρας ἠρνήσαντο, καὶ οὐκ ἐγένοντο γυναῖκες·
οὔτ᾽ ἄνδρες γεγάασιν, ἐπεὶ πάθον ἔργα γυναικῶν·
οὔτε γυναῖκες ἔασιν, ἐπεὶ φύσιν ἔλλαχον ἀνδρῶν.
ἀνέρες εἰσὶ γυναιξί, καὶ ἀνδράσιν εἰσὶ γυναῖκες.

They denied their manhood and did not become women,
nor were they born men, as they have suffered what women do;
nor are they women, since a man's nature was theirs.
They are men to women and women to men.[310]

The definition of *kinaidos* has been subjected to a considerable scholarly discussion.[311] Winkler (1990: 45-46.) describes him as "a man socially deviant in his entire being, principally observable in behaviour that flagrantly violated or contravened the dominant social definition of masculinity. To this extent, *kinaidos* was a category of person, not just of acts". He states that the *kinaidos* is the opposite of the hoplite warrior, which is "the ideal self to which every well-to-do citizen looks" (1990:46). Despite this definition, Winkler does not affirm that the *kinaidos* was a real type of man, hinting that it might be a literary creation, questioning if there really were any real *kinaidoi.*[312] Although acknowledging Winkler's reservations, Richlin (1993: 528) believes that a "free passive male lived with a social identity and a social burden much like the one that Foucault defined for the modern term "homosexual". Although focusing on Roman male-to-male sexual relationships, Richlin acknowledges the similarities between certain Roman attitudes towards homoerotic male intercourse and ancient Greek cultures.

[310] For this see also Johnson, Ryan, 2005: 180.
[311] Dover does not pay much attention to this term, only making a reference to it on page 17.
[312] Halperin (1998) follows Winkler's conception of *kinaidos.*

Davidson (1997: 179), the main critic of the active-passive model, disagrees with Winkler, stating that passivity and effeminacy were not the major defining traits of the *kinaidos*, but instead the incapacity to restrain his desires. For him, the "*kinaidos/katapugōn* is not a sexual pathic, humiliated and made effeminate by repeated domination, he is a nymphomaniac, full of womanish desire, who dresses up to attract men and has sex at the drop of a hat". Davidson's definition has been criticized by scholars such as Karras who stress the supposed misinterpretations that Davidson made of the existing scholarship use of "passivity". For Davidson (1997: 178 -179), previous concepts of *kinaidos* in scholarship consider them merely "inert objects", which does not reflect the actual Greek notion of being at the receiving end of penetration. As Karras (2000: 1259) states, the general scholarly conception of *kinaidos* as sexually passive only refers to the physical position he assumes during intercourse, being always considered a man that craves to be penetrated. Davidson (2007: 55-60) further developed his 1997 assertions on the meaning of *kinaidos*, once again emphasising that "there was nothing remotely passive or inactive about these kinaidoi", whose most important defining traits are "effeminacy" and "aggressive lewdness", and concluding that, at least for the classical Greeks, the *kinaidos* is a "willy-fiddle", a man who, due to the incapacity to restrain his sexual desires, takes pleasure in seducing boys.

Overall, classical scholarship generally agrees with Winkler's definition, that the *kinaidos* was a socially deviant figure, although I do believe that it was also real type of person. It makes no sense that Aeschines would directly highlight Demosthenes' *kinaidia*, or for Socrates in the *Gorgias* to insert the *kinaidos* in a discussion on what makes people happy and the pursuit of real pleasures, if there were no examples of actual people that could be branded as such. Davidson, especially in his 1997 remarks, is right when he emphasises that the major (or one of the most important) characteristics of the *kinaidos* is the incapacity to self-restrain, to control his appetites, a personality trait often attributed to women in antiquity. Karras is nevertheless also right when noting that Davidson often

misinterprets the use of 'passive' in previous scholarly definitions of *kinaidos*. Davidson's argument that the *kinaidos* is defined by the unrestrained pursuit of his pleasure, rather than by taking pleasure in being penetrated, is an extremely important addition to the study of this figure, and one not properly studied before him. However, his absolute negation of the importance of bodily penetration as one of the defining traits of the *kinaidos* is, in my opinion, too radical, consequently making it impossible for him to provide the complete meaning of the concept.[313] In other words, Davidson has a point, and he is, in my opinion, right. However, he is not the only one who is right, and by so vehemently denying the relevance of some of the arguments that preceded him, he fails to correctly interpret the full scope of the meaning of *kinaidos*.

Concluding this discussion, I believe that the scholars who have explored this figure in the past four decades did touch on every aspect that characterizes the *kinaidos*. The available information points to the conclusion that the *kinaidos* is the antithesis of what a man, or more specifically a citizen (the hoplite in Winkler's analysis), is supposed to be: a real, biologically male person who denies his masculinity by failing to be able to control his own desires (failing to be *sōphron*) and taking pleasure in activities that are typically gendered as feminine, consequently implying the capacity to derive pleasure from being penetrated, like a woman does, or by displaying other feminine traces, such as Demosthenes' taste for fine fabrics. By acting on these urges, that were considered unnatural for a man, the person shows that he is not capable of controlling himself, of living according to social norms, and the incapacity to follow said norms brands him as unfit to live in society, a social pariah. It is not clear if a man who feels urges that are related to the *kinaidos*, but chooses not to act on them, is indeed a *kinaidos*. The sources seem to imply that a *kinaidos* is not able to control and stop himself from pursuing his unnatural desires, but they do not specify if someone who feels those unnatural desires

[313] As Fisher (2001: 47) noted, Davidson's arguments do not "necessarily make the alternative account redundant".

but does not pursue them is or is not, in any way, a *kinaidos*. When Aristotle, in the already quoted passage from the *Nicomachean Ethics*, refers to men that, due to having been sexually abused as children, derive pleasure from being sexually penetrated, he is, I believe, referring to a *kinaidos*. However, in this specific situation, he is referring to someone who was not born deviant, but made deviant instead, who takes pleasure from assuming the role of the woman, from negating his own masculinity. He is referring to a man that was 'deformed' by a violent action during his childhood, a boy who, by being sexually abused, would not grow up to become a man.

Although Aristotle does not make a literal reference to *kinaidos* in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, we do have one reference to the word in another text of the Aristotelian corpus (*Physiognomics* 808a12-6):[314]

Κιναίδου σημεῖα ὄμμα κατακεκλασμένον, γονύκροτος· ἐγκλίσεις τῆς κεφαλῆς εἰς τὰ δεξιά· αἱ φοραὶ τῶν χειρῶν ὕπτιαι καὶ ἔκλυτοι, καὶ βαδίσεις διτταί, ἡ μὲν περινεύοντος, ἡ δὲ κρατοῦντος τὴν ὀσφύν·

The signs of a *kinaidos* are an unsteady eye and knock-knees; he inclines his head to the right; he gestures with his palms up and his wrists loose; and he has two styles of walking - either waggling his hips or keeping them under control.

The author describes the physicality of the *kinaidos* in a grotesque way, showing a human that does not possess a normal body but instead suffers the deformities that result from his unnatural craving.[315] In connection with Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, these unnatural cravings might be permanent repercussions from being sexually abused as a child.

[314] Winkler in *Before sexuality* p. 199.

[315] I cannot avoid noticing that some of the details that the author provides in this passage are interestingly close to slang terms used, nowadays, to refer to effeminate men. In northern Portugal, the place where I grew up, it would be common to hear comments relating boys that gestured a lot, displaying loose wrists, with effeminate or homosexual tendencies. Expressions like "vais jogar basket?" (are you going to play basketball?) or "vais servir às mesas?" (are you going to be a waiter?), were offensive expressions that highlighted a boy's lack of masculinity.

2.7. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have explored the concept of child sexuality in ancient Greece, how children of both genders could be seen as objects of sexual desire, the appropriate age for a child to start their active sexual life and the boundaries for such contact. As I stated at the beginning, we cannot speak of paedophilia in ancient Greece using our modern conception of the term. If we consider, for example, the *DSM-V* definition of paedophilic disorder, which sets the diagnostic criteria for someone who is aroused by a prepubescent child, we quickly conclude that it is not applicable to ancient Greece. It is impossible to diagnose someone in ancient Athens from suffering from a mental disorder because he his sexually attracted to children. I understand how easy it is to brand Greeks as paedophiles (in the modern sense of the term), using modern criteria that were constructed based on modern socio-religious perspectives, however if we confront a society where sex with boys and girls of twelve or fourteen was a somewhat accepted practice, the premises that the *DSM* establishes for pedophilic disorder cease to make sense. Once again, we cannot speak of paraphilia. Men were generally attracted by younger boys, at the onset of puberty, whose bodies were yet underdeveloped. Sexual attraction for youngsters that in today's Western societies would be deemed too young to be involved in a sexual relationship with a much older man seems to have been common, and was therefore the norm in ancient Greece, and not the *para* norm. Therefore, the Greeks would not consider themselves to suffer from any sort of mental disorder because they were attracted by children. Even when we speak of prepubescent children, it seems that they could be objects of sexual desire nonetheless, however, acting on those urges could be met with social and potential legal punishment. That does not mean that the abused child could not display signs of psychological consequences from the violence that he suffered. As explored in the previous section, it seems that at least Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics* considered the possibility that the boy's development could be

affected by systematic sexual abuse, influencing his sexual preferences in the future. For Aristotle, boys that were sexually abused could develop pleasure from being the passive partner through habituation, one of the main traces of the *kinaidos*, a social pariah.

Contrary to today's term, the verb *paidophileō* conveyed a socially sanctioned expression of love for children, a crucial sentiment for the practice of pederasty. The Greeks did not express sexual abuse of children using this verb, but rather with expressions that conveyed violence and shame, such as *biazō* and *hubrizō*. Therefore, when we seek to discuss paedophilia in ancient Greece, without discussing the sexual value that children could have, we are falling into an anachronistic trap. However, the fact that paedophilia meant something different for the ancient Greeks does not mean that its general meaning, the sexual abuse of children, was not a problem. I have demonstrated how it was possible to love a child, and how it was not. The onset of puberty is the line that generally separates the child that is too young to be part of a relationship where sex was expected, from the one that is not yet mature enough. That does not mean that prepubescent boys and girls were not also sources of sexual desire, but we have far fewer examples of such demonstrations, which hints at a negative social and potential legal reaction towards the adult and also allows space to wonder about what happened behind closed doors, although, as I explained, even if in-family child sexual abuse happened, it is very unlikely that it would ever become public. This case could indeed be a simultaneous occurrence of two sexual transgressions that the ancient sources, as I demonstrated in the introduction, deemed to be against nature or social norms – sex with children and sex between close relatives (in the case of sexual abuse by the father, for example). As I have indicated in the introduction and in each chapter, child sexual abuse, like sexual visual transgression, human-animal sex or sex with corpses, would not lead to reproduction. Neither the abuse of a boy nor that of a girl, still prepubescent, would result in reproduction.

The sources do convey that prepubescent boys were off limits, that they should be allowed time to mature and then decide upon a potential suitor to engage in a pederastic relationship, the only sort of child sexual love that was accepted, and, as I have explained, pederasty does not correspond to our modern sense of sexual abuse of children. The legislation that I have analysed points towards a legal necessity to protect children, both pubescent and prepubescent. That does not mean that ancient legal systems (Athens and Beroea for example) contained a law like our modern statutory rape laws. Indeed, Pausanias in the *Symposium* (181C-2A), seems to state that such a law did not exist, although in his opinion it should. It is possible that a case of sexual abuse of children could be brought under the law of hubris, and Plato does express the opinion that anyone who forcibly violates and shames a child should be put to death, although, as we have seen, it would be unlikely that a father would decide to prosecute, seeking to avoid creating public awareness towards the defilement of his children. I believe that Fisher (2001: 38-39) sums up the legal perspective on this subject very well:

> There is no evidence on how often, if at all, these laws designed to protect the younger boys against sexual abuse or prostitution resulted in prosecutions. In principle Athenian fathers might claim that any sexual act by an outsider, against their permission, with a son not yet of age (or indeed an unmarried daughter) rendered the seducer or rapist liable to a charge of hybris against the offender, conceived as a gross insult to the father and family. […] Conviction would be difficult, especially on what was regarded as the very serious charge of hybris, and the publicity might well be more likely to increase family shame than to save it. One might, however, suspect (though there is no evidence) that the younger the boy, the greater the likelihood of a stronger desire to prosecute, and a better chance of success.

Despite the lack of information concerning the legal practice, all the evidence that I have analysed consistently shows that sexually using a free prepubescent child would be deemed as a serious transgression of social boundaries. Strato clearly shows that he thinks that courting a prepubescent boy is a shameful act. Isocrates says that the rogue Greeks in Ionia who violated little girls and women (παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας) were barbaric. Fathers, aware of the erotic appeal of their sons, would make a slave accompany them, so as to protect them from potential offenders. Pausanias, in the *Symposium*, clearly thinks

that there should be a law forbidding men to approach prepubescent boys and condemns those men who try to benefit from a boy's naiveness to sexually use them. There clearly was a social notion that a prepubescent child who was too young was off-limits. Obviously, slave children are not included in this social perspective. They were generally deemed accessible bodies to their masters and to whomever their master saw fit to give access, with almost no regulation.

Therefore, in this chapter, as for voyeurism in the previous one, I have shown the reasons why we cannot speak of paedophilia and consequently paraphilia in ancient Greece, however the evidence shows that the sexual use of children that were off-limits would be considered a sexual transgression or, as I denominate it in this thesis, a paraphilia. In the following two chapters I shall explore two different sexual behaviours that also fit the pattern already identified in sexual visual transgression and sexual abuse of children, further emphasising the conception of sexual transgression that existed in ancient Greece.

CHAPTER 3

HUMAN ANIMAL SEX

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter I explore sexual intercourse between humans and animals in ancient Greece, showing how it was recognized as behaviour that transgressed natural and socially stipulated boundaries. Like the methodology applied in the previous chapters, I start by providing a general view of the normal relationship between humans and animals in the ancient world. It is crucial to start by understanding the conception and general contact that ancient Greeks had with animals, to assess how they perceived the possibility of engaging in sexual intercourse with them. By framing the correct behaviour it becomes easier to identify the incorrect and better understand why it was considered transgressive. I then move to an analysis of mythological accounts where sex between anthropomorphic figures and animals is conveyed, such as the sexual encounters in animal forms of Leda, Europa and Pasiphae. I chose to separate this section into two, one where I address myths where animal-shaped gods have intercourse with women, and a second that focuses on Pasiphae and her passion for the bull. I opted for this structure because the myths convey different types of story and therefore different sets of morals. Although there is an animal element in the myths of Leda and Europa, the male figure is nonetheless a god and not a real animal. As Buxton (2009: 158) noted, the most common reason for gods to undergo a process of metamorphosis is erotic passion, desire to engage in sexual intercourse. Leda, for example, is not attracted to the swan because she has a particular fetish for birds; but rather because it is a god that seduces her. Therefore, although these myths show that an image of sex between animal and humans was common in Greek mythology, they do not,

however, convey the general perception of actual sex between humans and animals. While analysing the myth of Pasiphae, I properly explore this dichotomy, establishing comparisons between Pasiphae, Leda and Europa, ascertaining their different structures and explaining what each type of myth tells us about ancient Greek society. Pasiphae is a particularly interesting example, because her transgression results in the birth of a monstrous creature, contrary to what would happen to a person who engaged in sex with an animal. As was noted in the previous chapter, human-animal sexual intercourse is also a sexual act that does not lead to biological reproduction. The myth of Pasiphae, as I explore in the following sections, entertains the possibility of reproduction through this act, which could only result in a monstrous outcome, therefore reemphasising the transgressive aspect of such sexual behaviour. As I stated in the thesis' introduction, I generally treat myths as conveyers of moral perceptions of ancient Greek societies[316] and this is particularly perceptible in this chapter.

I then explore the artistic representations of scenes of sex between humans and animals. It will be noted that, in the art section, I do not particularly explore representations of the myths that I analysed in the previous sections. I do not explore, in detail, artistic representations of those myths since the sexual act is never represented. Leda is sometimes showed being embraced by the neck of the swan, and Europa is almost always depicted with the bull, either on top or alongside it, but never in actual intercourse. If we move to the myth of Pasiphae, this lack of representation is even clearer. Although we do have several representations of the minotaur, specially the *topos* of his death at the hands of Theseus, we not only do not have Greek representations of Pasiphae and the bull, but also virtually no representations of Pasiphae alone. This is explained in section 3.3.2. Therefore, in the art section I chose to study the few examples of sexual depiction in Greek vase paintings that are not representations of a specific myth. In the final section

[316] See section 1.3.

I analyse several non-mythological sources that make references to sex between humans and animals. Besides returning to the already quoted passage of Plutarch's *Bruta animalia ratione uti,* and to Artemidorus, I will also approach passages by Herodotus, Theocritus, Plutarch and Athenaeus. In all these sources we find references to sex between humans and animals, almost always expressing a sense of negative appraisal of the act. We have more references, outside of the mythological corpus, of men having sex with animals than women, and this might be an indicator that there were fewer episodes of sex between a woman and a male animal than a female animal and a man; or that the idea of a woman copulating with an animal was more negative than if the human was a man. If the first hypothesis is true, this can be partially explained by the logistics of sexual activity: it is simpler for a man to force penetration but it would be more complicated for a woman to arouse and attract a male animal.[317] The evidence provided by the non-mythological sources is contrary to the common typology of human-animal sex in mythological accounts, where usually the female figure is taken by an animal, or an animal-shaped god. I explore this in detail in the following sections.

But first, there is a question of terminology. The act of sex with animals is usually referred to as bestiality or zoophilia, both being modern terms that have specific usages in today's world, although they are usually interchangeable and commonly applied as synonyms. We see this also happening in classical scholarship. Robson (2002), one of the most relevant pieces of classical scholarship on the subject, refers to sex between humans and animals as bestiality. White (2004: 152) uses bestiality to refer to sexual intercourse between goatherds and goats in Theocritus' first *Idyll*. Gilhus (2006: 16) speaks of sexual contact between humans and animals, without using a term to define it. Alexandridis (2008) explores how zoophilia was imagined in ancient Greece.[318] Younger (2011: 84-

[317] For this see also Johns, 1982: 110-111.
[318] This is the term used by the *DSM-V* (705), when referring to 'recurrent and intense sexual arousal involving' animals.

86) uses bestiality to refer to sex between humans and animals in myth and art. Younger (2011: 84-86) uses bestiality to refer to sex between humans and animals in myth and art. Boer (2015), explores the concept of bestiality in the ancient Near East. He defines bestiality as "sexual acts between human beings and animals", although recognizing that there are other terms such as zoophilia and zooerasty.[319] It is also commonly used in modern scholarship on mental disorders, when it approaches ancient Greek myths where animals and humans enjoy sexual intercourse.[320]

The Greeks did not have a specific term for sexual intercourse between human and animals, like we do today.[321] Therefore, to discuss this subject, it is necessary to borrow a term from our modern lexicon, like Robson and Alexandridis did, or to coin a new one. I do not think that 'bestiality' is a good solution, since it is a term also applied with reference to the beast-like personality of a certain person. It is common to find in scholarship on Herakles, for example, Ryzman (1993: 77) refers to the "bestial" aspects of Herakles' nature. Papadimitropoulos (2008: 131) refers to Herakles' "own bestiality". Lissarrague (1990) constantly uses the term to define the animal characteristics of satyrs. In Greek literature, we sometimes find the term *thēriōdēs* (θηριώδης) being used to refer to someone's, either human or animal, beast-like characteristics. In the already analysed passage from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (1149a), Aristotle states that actions such as eating human flesh or specifically eating one's own child are *thēriōdēs*.[322] In the *History of Animals* (502b), the author uses the same term when mentioning similarities between apes and men, such as hands, fingers and nails, although the ape's body is more *thēriōdēs*, more 'beastlike' (πλὴν πάντα ταῦτα ἐπὶ τὸ θηριωδέστερον). In Euripides'

[319] He further justifies his choice on the terminology by stating that "bestiality has become the term in common usage since the seventeenth century".
[320] Miletski (2002: 11-12), for example, uses 'bestiality' to refer to the myths of Pasiphae and Leda. For a short approach to the terms used to express this sexual action, see Miletski, 2002.
[321] As I have noted in the introduction, several sources refer to sex with beasts as an example of sex against *physis*. Artemidorus, for example, refers to it as *thēriō migēnai*, "mixing with animals".
[322] Rackham (1934) translates the term as "bestiality". Crisp (2000) translates it as "brutish" and Reeve (2014) as "beast-like".

Trojan Women (671), Andromache refers to animals as *thēriōdēs,* 'beast-like', because they cannot speak or think. In *Suppliant Women* (202), Theseus uses *thēriōdēs* to refer to the beast-like state of humans before the gods gave them order. Therefore, although the Greeks did not have a word to define bestiality as sexual intercourse between human and animals, they did have a term that can be translated as 'bestiality' to allude to someone's beast-like personality, a meaning that today's bestiality can also carry. Therefore, I prefer not to adopt 'bestiality', for the sake of clarity and to avoid mixing up our modern preconceptions of the meaning of 'bestiality' with ancient Greeks' conceptions of animals' qualities.

Alexandridis (2008) chose to use 'zoophilia' a term that was coined, and is mostly used, in a psychiatric context.[323] For the sake of clarity, the author carefully highlighted that her use of the term is a partial adaptation, since she is not referring to the psychiatric significance of the term, but rather just implying an erotic bond between humans and animals. Despite the initial explanation regarding the chosen terminology, I do not think that Alexandridis' option is the appropriate either. Despite her initial explanation of the meaning she grants the term in her paper, the fact is that zoophilia is a term commonly used in psychiatric scholarship that does not solely refer to sexual contact with an animal, but also to emotional connection between human and animal. This was indeed the meaning implemented by Krafft-Ebing when he first coined the term in 1886.[324] Overall, bestiality is used with reference to the physical act of sex between humans and animals, while zoophilia is widely used to refer to the emotional, sexual desire that a human may feel for an animal.[325]

[323] In contrast with 'bestiality', which is more often used in the legal context. For this see Holoyda, Newman, 2014; and Ranger, Fedoroff, 2014.
[324] Miletsky (2009: 5-7) provides a short literature review of the use of the term, showing the dichotomy that is found in scholarship between the usage of bestiality and zoophilia.
[325] This is, indeed, Miletsky's position in his book, where he chooses to use bestiality to refer to "any sexual contact between a human being and a nonhuman animal", and zoophilia as "an emotional attachment and/or sexual attraction to an animal"". There are, nonetheless, other terms that were coined to address this issue. Ranger and Fedoroff (2014) list a few of them: Zoosexual (equivalent to zoophilia), zoosadism (sexual arousal from cruelty to animals), faunophilia (sexual arousal from observing animal sexual activity) or simply, zoo (a general term used by many self-identified people with zoophilic interests).

Since, in this chapter, I not only explore examples of sexual contact between humans and animals but also examples of sexual emotional attachments between humans and animals, I prefer not to use zoophilia. Once again, modern conceptualization of these sexual behaviours does not fit the perception that the ancients had. We cannot discuss sex with animals as a paraphilia in ancient Greece, however we have enough evidence to affirm that it was considered a para-philia, a transgressional sexual act. Instead of borrowing modern terminology, in this chapter I will refer to both physical sexual acts between human and animals, as well as sexual emotional affection between human and animals, as 'human-animal sex'. This expression covers a wider scope of meanings than any of the previous options, and correctly fits the ancient examples that I explore in this chapter. By having 'human' prior to 'animal', the term already exemplifies the superiority that humans have over animals, as explored in the next section. By human, I mean both references to mortal persons in myth, as well as to the persons mentioned by non-mythological sources. It correctly addresses, for example, the myth of Pasiphae, where a real animal has intercourse with a person; as well as the references by Plutarch and Athenaeus. By 'animal' I refer to actual animals and not to animal-shaped gods. As already stated, myths where a metamorphosed god has sex with a person are not examples of the sexual behaviour that I aim to explore in this chapter. It is important to approach these myths since they convey an imagery of animals and humans having intercourse, however they can never be considered under the same light, according to the same morals, as sex between an actual animal and a person. It is also important to explore them to establish the differences between this typology of myths and the myth of Pasiphae, much more relevant to the study of human-animal sex. By sex, I imply both actual sexual intercourse, as well as demonstrations of sexual desire or erotic/romantic attachment. It covers both Pasiphae's intense sexual lust for the bull, as well as Athenaeus' reference to the dolphin who fell in love with a boy.

To understand how human-animal sex might be understood by ancient Greeks, I first need to explore their perception of animals, and specifically how they conceived animals in opposition to humans. I show, in the next section, that the Greeks generally thought that animals were considered sub-human creatures in their conception of the natural order of world, and therefore an act of human-animal sex consists in the transgression of the natural boundaries between species.

3.2. Animals in the Greek world

In this section I explore the perception of animals in ancient Greece, and specifically their relationship with humans. There are a considerable number of sources that discuss the differences between humans and animals. It is a common topic in philosophical texts, from the sixth century onwards, where some of the common discussion encompassing animals focuses on their capacity to reason, and to feel passion or other typical human emotions.[326] I will provide a brief insight into some of those sources, with the aim of clarifying the general notion of the position of animals in relation to humans in the natural order of the Greek world.

Different texts show that the ancient Greeks wondered about the origins of animals and the differences that separated them from humans. In Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* (450-466), Prometheus refers to the gifts he bestowed upon humans, separating them from the animals:

[…] κοὔτε πλινθυφεῖς
δόμους προσείλους ἦσαν, οὐ ξυλουργίαν,
κατωρύχες δ᾽ ἔναιον ὥστ᾽ ἀήσυροι

[326] One of the most influential books on this topic, constantly quoted in every study of animals in ancient Greece, is Sorabji, 1993. The Oxford handbook of animals in classical thought and life (edited by Gordon Lindsay Campbell) is the most complete single volume on animals in ancient Greece and Rome.

μύρμηκες ἄντρων ἐν μυχοῖς ἀνηλίοις.
ἦν δ᾽ οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς οὔτε χείματος τέκμαρ
οὔτ᾽ ἀνθεμώδους ἦρος οὔτε καρπίμου
θέρους βέβαιον, ἀλλ᾽ ἄτερ γνώμης τὸ πᾶν
ἔπρασσον, ἔστε δή σφιν ἀντολὰς ἐγὼ
ἄστρων ἔδειξα τάς τε δυσκρίτους δύσεις.
καὶ μὴν ἀριθμόν, ἔξοχον σοφισμάτων,
ἐξηῦρον αὐτοῖς, γραμμάτων τε συνθέσεις,
μνήμην ἁπάντων, μουσομήτορ᾽ ἐργάνην·
κἄζευξα πρῶτος ἐν ζυγοῖσι κνώδαλα,
ζεύγλαισι δουλεύοντα σάγμασίν θ᾽, ὅπως
θνητοῖς μεγίστων διάδοχοι μοχθημάτων
γένοινθ᾽, ὑφ᾽ ἅρμα τ᾽ ἤγαγον φιληνίους
ἵππους, ἄγαλμα τῆς ὑπερπλούτου χλιδῆς

They knew nothing of brick-built,
sun-warmed houses, nor of wooden construction;
they dwelt underground, like tiny ants,
in the sunless recesses of caves.
Nor had they any reliable indicator of winter,
or of flowery spring, or of fruitful summer;
they did everything without planning,
until I showed them the hard-to-discern risings
and settings of stars.
I also invented for them the art of number, supreme among all techniques,
and that of combining letters into written words,
the tool that enables all things to be remembered and is mother of the Muses.
And I was the first to bring beasts under the yoke
as slaves to the yoke-strap and the pack-saddle,
so that they might relieve humans of their greatest labours;
and I brought horses to love the rein and pull chariots,
making them a luxurious ornament for men of great wealth.[327]

It is implied in the text that there are differences between humans and animals. It starts by emphasising the ignorance of humans when they were created, possibly implying that they were closer to animals, but those limitations were overcome by Prometheus' actions, who gave humans knowledge and skills that became essential to civilization, such as construction techniques or even language. Only after humans had the capacity to speak and write, one of the striking differences between them and wild animals, did Prometheus teach them on how to domesticate animals and how to enslave, *douleuonta*, them to human will. In Aeschylus, the meaning of animal existence was to service the needs of humans.

[327] Tr. Sommerstein.

These two skills that Prometheus states that he bestowed upon humankind, the ability to build things and to speak, are also mentioned in another retelling of the myth of Prometheus, in Plato's *Protagoras* (320c-322b). According to this version, when mortal beings were created, Epimetheus was in charge of equipping them with skills and capacities. Epimetheus, however, was not successful in this enterprise, since he provided all the skills to the irrational animals (ἄλογος), leaving humans with nothing, naked, unshod and without capacity to defend themselves. Prometheus then stole skills from Hephaestus and Athena, namely skills in art and fire (ἔντεχνον σοφίαν σὺν πυρί), and, in time, humankind would develop the capacity to speak and write, build houses, weave clothes and farm the land.[328] By sharing the gods' gifts, man was now the only creature able to acknowledge the gods, a factor that establishes humans' superiority over animals in the natural order of the Greek world. As in the myth that Aeschylus adapts, in *Protagoras* Prometheus is responsible for bestowing upon humans the skills that differentiate them from animals, namely the capacity to speak and build, to think and to be creative. In Plato's version, it is also emphasised that humans are the only creature able to acknowledge the gods, therefore establishing the order of world: gods, humans, animals.[329]

This order is also perceptible in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (4.3.9-12). In this text, Socrates shows Euthydemus all that the gods provide to humans, such as light, water, and fire. To Socrates, these gifts are signs that the main function of gods is to care for humankind. His arguments are so convincing, that Euthydemus starts to consider if the gods have time for anything else other than servicing humanity. The only difficulty he finds in accepting this notion, is that everything that Socrates pronounced as being a divine gift to humanity, is equally a gift to animals (ὅτι καὶ τἆλλα ζῷα τούτων μετέχει).

[328] The human ability of building new things as an opposite to animals is also perceived in Diodorus (1.7-8). For this, see Harden, 2013: 23-256.
[329] On this text see also Harden, 2013: 22.

Already here we can perceive that animals are considered a subhuman category of living creatures, since Euthydemus cannot understand why the gods would provide the same gifts to both humans and animals. Socrates, however, puts Euthydemus' mind at rest, showing him that animals only partake of humankind divine gifts because it is useful for humans that they do so:

Οὐ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτ᾽, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης, φανερόν, ὅτι καὶ ταῦτα ἀνθρώπων ἕνεκα γίγνεταί τε καὶ ἀνατρέφεται; τί γὰρ ἄλλο ζῷον αἰγῶν τε καὶ οἰῶν καὶ βοῶν καὶ ἵππων καὶ ὄνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων τοσαῦτα ἀγαθὰ ἀπολαύει ὅσα ὁ ἄνθρωπος; ἐμοὶ μὲν γὰρ δοκεῖ πλείω ἢ τῶν φυτῶν· τρέφονται γοῦν καὶ χρηματίζονται οὐδὲν ἧττον ἀπὸ τούτων ἢ ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνων· πολὺ δὲ γένος ἀνθρώπων τοῖς μὲν ἐκ τῆς γῆς φυομένοις εἰς τροφὴν οὐ χρῆται, ἀπὸ δὲ βοσκημάτων γάλακτι καὶ τυρῷ καὶ κρέασι τρεφόμενοι ζῶσι· πάντες δὲ τιθασεύοντες καὶ δαμάζοντες τὰ χρήσιμα τῶν ζῴων εἴς τε πόλεμον καὶ εἰς ἄλλα πολλὰ συνεργοῖς χρῶνται.

[Εὐθύδημος] Ὁμογνωμονῶ σοι καὶ τοῦτ᾽, ἔφη· ὁρῶ γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ πολὺ ἰσχυρότερα ἡμῶν οὕτως ὑποχείρια γιγνόμενα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὥστε χρῆσθαι αὐτοῖς ὅ τι ἂν βούλωνται.

"Yes," replied Socrates, "and isn't it evident that they too receive life and food for the sake of mankind? For what animal reaps so many benefits as the human being from goats and sheep and horses and oxen and asses and the other animals? We owe more to them, in my opinion, than to the fruits of the earth. At the least they are not less valuable to us for food and commerce; in fact, a large portion of mankind does not use the products of the earth for food but lives on the milk and cheese and meat they get from livestock. Moreover, all people tame and domesticate the useful kinds of animals and make them their fellow workers in war and many other undertakings."

[Euthydemus] "There too I agree with you, seeing that animals far stronger than humans become so entirely subject to us that we put them to any use we choose."[330]

Socrates' argument is clear. Animals and humans both partake of some of the divine gifts that the gods bestowed upon the world, but that is by itself a gift to humankind. By bestowing on animals everything they need to survive and reproduce, the gods are ensuring that the humans have everything they need for their own survival, since humans enjoy the meat, milk and cheese that derive from these animals. Socrates' argument is so clear that Euthydemus has no other option than to acquiesce: the animals are a gift from the gods to humans, and the overwhelming sign that humans are superior is the fact that they can tame and control animals far stronger than them.

[330] Tr. Marchant.

Socrates further builds on this, highlighting the capacities that the gods endowed humankind with alone:

Τὸ δ', ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ μὲν καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα, διαφέροντα δὲ ἀλλήλων ἐστί προσθεῖναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις αἰσθήσεις ἁρμοττούσας πρὸς ἕκαστα, δι' ὧν ἀπολαύομεν πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν· τὸ δὲ καὶ λογισμὸν ἡμῖν ἐμφῦσαι, ᾧ περὶ ὧν αἰσθανόμεθα λογιζόμενοί τε καὶ μνημονεύοντες καταμανθάνομεν, ὅπῃ ἕκαστα συμφέρει, καὶ πολλὰ μηχανώμεθα, δι' ὧν τῶν τε ἀγαθῶν ἀπολαύομεν καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀλεξόμεθα· τὸ δὲ καὶ ἑρμηνείαν δοῦναι, δι' ἧς πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν μεταδίδομέν τε ἀλλήλοις διδάσκοντες καὶ κοινωνοῦμεν καὶ νόμους τιθέμεθα καὶ πολιτευόμεθα;

"Think again of the multitude of things beautiful and useful and their infinite variety, and how the gods have endowed mankind with senses adapted for the perception of every kind, so that there is nothing good that we cannot enjoy; and again, how they have implanted in us the faculty of reasoning, whereby we are able to reason about the objects of our perceptions and commit them to memory, and so come to know what advantage every kind can yield and devise many ways to enjoy the good and drive away the bad; and think of the power of expression, which enables us to impart to one another all good things by teaching and to take our share of them, to enact laws and to administer states."[331]

There are three key attributes that are held by humans alone among animals - *aisthēsis*, "perception"; *logismos*, "reasoning"; and *hermēneia*, "expression". By adding this to the discussion of the distinction between humans and animals, Socrates is implying that the major differences between them is the intellectual capacity of the human being. The distinction between rational and irrational animals was already made earlier in antiquity. The capacity to think, seems to be a general differentiating factor between human and other animals. We can already perceive this in the texts of Diogenes of Apollonia. He claimed that air was the source of all things, including the capacity to think, that, according to him, arises from pure and dry air.[332] This is the reason why animals are inferior in thinking when compared with humans, since they breathe air that comes out of the ground and so is less pure.

Aristotle further builds on the distinctions between humans and animals, highlighting the intellectual differences between the two. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1178b), he argues that the capacity to contemplate (θεωρία) is a prerogative of both gods

[331] Tr. Marchant.
[332] Diogenes of Apollonia's statement of the difference between animals and humans survived in Theophrastus' *On the Senses*, 39-45. For this see Graham, 2010: 449-450.

and humans, being the only path to true happiness. In his opinion, animals cannot partake of a full sense of happiness, because they do not possess the capacity of contemplation:

σημεῖον δὲ καὶ τὸ μὴ μετέχειν τὰ λοιπὰ ζῷα εὐδαιμονίας, τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας ἐστερημένα τελείως. τοῖς μὲν γὰρ θεοῖς ἅπας ὁ βίος μακάριος, τοῖς δ᾽ ἀνθρώποις ἐφ᾽ ὅσον ὁμοίωμά τι τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας ὑπάρχει τῶν δ᾽ ἄλλων ζώων οὐδὲν εὐδαιμονεῖ, ἐπειδὴ οὐδαμῇ κοινωνεῖ θεωρίας. ἐφ᾽ ὅσον δὴ διατείνει ἡ θεωρία, καὶ ἡ εὐδαιμονία, καὶ οἷς μᾶλλον ὑπάρχει τὸ θεωρεῖν, καὶ εὐδαιμονεῖν, οὐ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν θεωρίαν· αὐτὴ γὰρ καθ᾽ αὑτὴν τιμία. ὥστ᾽ εἴη ἂν ἡ εὐδαιμονία θεωρία τις.

A further confirmation is that the lower animals cannot partake of happiness, because they are completely devoid of the contemplative activity. The whole of the life of the gods is blessed, and that of man is so in so far as it contains some likeness to the divine activity; but none of the other animals possess happiness, because they are entirely incapable of contemplation. Happiness therefore is co-extensive in its range with contemplation: the more a class of beings possesses the faculty of contemplation, the more it enjoys happiness, not as an accidental concomitant of contemplation but as inherent in it, since contemplation is valuable in itself. It follows that happiness is some form of contemplation.[333]

Since both men and gods share the capacity of contemplation, the human is more connected to the divine than the animal. Once again, we are faced with the natural scale of living creatures: the ones with less capacity to reason are the animals, consequently they are subject to the will of humans, who inherently are less capable than the immortal gods. This seems to have been the most common scheme of thought in ancient Greece, a scheme that is reinforced by daily life. We should think of the daily contact that most people would have with animals. They needed to eat, and so meat would come from hunting and animal breeding, besides milk and cheese, as Socrates said in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. The use of animals' strength would be a necessity for agricultural work, construction and transportation. Animals played a part in the war effort.[334] The sacrifice of animals would be a central part of any religious celebration, as well as of spectacles.[335] These interactions are based on the premise that humans are superior to animals, since they are capable of taming them and forcing them to comply with their desires and needs.

[333] Tr. Rackham.
[334] For animals and warfare, see Mayor, 2014.
[335] On the use of animals in spectacles, see Shelton, 2014.

It is important to grasp this conception of the Greek world to properly understand how human-animal sex might have been considered. Since the sources indicate that, for several reasons, humans were superior to animals, second only to gods; we can then argue that sexual interaction between humans and animals confuses the natural order of the world, transgressing the boundaries that separate both species. Human-animal sex in ancient Greece entails a sexual action between a human and sub-human creature. It is, by definition, a transgression of nature, as Artemidorus seems to consider.[336] It also helps us to understand why myths such as Leda or Europa, and the myth of Pasiphae convey a different social value. Leda had sexual intercourse with Zeus, a god in animal shape, the top of the natural order. Pasiphae felt an enormous lust for a bull, an actual animal. Therefore, these two sexual encounters are very different, and result in widely dissimilar outcomes, as I show in the next section.

3.3. Myths

3.3.1. Animal-shaped gods

As was stated in the introduction, there are several ancient Greek myths where a human, usually a girl, is sexually involved with an animal-shaped god, usually Zeus.[337] Here, I take a closer look to the myths of Leda, Europa, and Persephone. These myths generally follow the same structure, with minor differences. The first two are paradigmatic examples of sex between mortal girls and a god transformed into the shape of an animal. The myth of Persephone is an example of a goddess, and not a mortal girl, who notwithstanding succumbs to Zeus' sexual appetite. I believe that it is important to briefly explore these myths because, although they do not represent human-animal sex,

[336] See section 1.2.
[337] As Deacy (2018:105) noted, Zeus is "the most rape-prone of all the Greek gods".

they are nevertheless testimonies of the common imagery of erotic attachments between animal-shaped creatures and humans. It is also relevant to strike a comparison with the myth of Pasiphae, as I do in the next section, which departs from this mythological structure.

The myth of Leda is first mentioned in Homer (*Od.* 11.298-304), however there is no reference to the sex episode in the *Odyssey*. It is, nevertheless, mentioned in the *Homeric Hymns* (17; 33), where it is stated that Zeus secretly forced her (λάθρη ὑποδμηθεῖσα). Therefore, the myth of Leda was known at least from the seventh-sixth century B.C.E.,[338] although the animal sex element was not yet prominent, only appearing in Euripides. In *Helen* (16-22), the protagonist explains that she supposedly was the daughter of Zeus, who pursued Leda and copulated with her taking the form of a swan.[339]

The myth of Europa follows a similar structure. There is a brief reference to her in Homer (*Il*. 14.321-322), where Zeus confesses that he has loved the daughter of Phoenix, who bore Rhadamanthys and Minos. Moschus (2) also refers to Europa as the daughter of Phoenix, but in Apollodorus (3.1.1) she is referred to as the daughter of Agenor and Telephassa.[340] Like the myth of Leda, it seems that the oldest version of this myth did not consider the animal element in the sex narrative. Apollodorus (2.5.7), when conveying the seventh labour of Herakles, the Cretan bull, states that Acusilaus said that the bull was the one who carried Europa to Zeus, and so Zeus was not the beast itself. When we get to Moschus, in the second century B.C.E., the sexual encounter is clear. He mentions how Zeus spied on her and her girl companions while they were among the flowers in the meadow, transformed into a bull so he could escape the eyes of Hera, and

[338] See also Alcalde Martin, 1998: 11.
[339] The same tradition is once again referred to by the chorus in Iphigenia at Aulis (794-800). Apollodorus (3.10.7) also makes a reference to these myths, although providing an alternative version of the birth of Helen. According to him, some said that Helen was a daughter of Nemesis and Zeus. When being pursued by Zeus, Nemesis morphed into a goose, trying to throw the attacker off her scent, however Zeus also transformed into an animal, the swan, and raped her nonetheless. The choice of the animal is particularly interesting, since a swan belongs to the *anatidae* family of the *anseriformes* order of birds, such as ducks, being the only type of birds that have a penis and so, theoretically, it would be physically possible for a woman to copulate with a swan.
[340] This seems to be the most common tradition in the time of Ovid (*Met*. 2.833-875).

the attraction that the girls immediately felt for the bull, how he licked Europa's neck (λιχμάζεσκε δέρην) and in return she kissed him (κύσε ταῦρον).[341] Only then does he kidnap the girl, taking her to Crete where he then reveals himself, returning to his anthropomorphic form, and has sex with her.

The myth of the birth of Zagreus, a proto-form of Dionysus, also involves Zeus having sex with a female character in the form of an animal. The surviving final version of the myth is found in Nonnos, however, the connection between Persephone and Dionysus seems to have been an important part of Dionysiac rituals, and so it would certainly be known well before Nonnos, who is conveying a mythological tradition that existed centuries before his time.[342] Diodorus (3.64) refers to Persephone as Dionysus' mother, although not mentioning the sexual episode. The myth told in the *Dionysiaca* (5.565-570) states that Zeus took the form of a serpent (δράκων) and took her virginity, when she was still unwed (Περσεφόνης σύλησεν ἀνυμφεύτοιο κορείην).[343]

In all of these myths there seems to be no punishment for the god, nor for the female characters. There is no reference to any consequence for Leda, for example. She was sexually involved with someone other than her husband, and carried the offender's progeny, that were raised by Tyndareus as his own.[344] Similarly, there is no punishment brought upon Europa for copulating with Zeus. Persephone also does not suffer any punishment. The child born of that encounter is later destroyed by the Titans, however this is not a consequence of the human-animal sex *per se*, but rather of Hera's need to avenge her husband's infidelities.[345] Although, as I have already noted, these myths

[341] Buxton (2009: 130), argues that this moment is not a proper case of bestiality: "Moschos comes teasingly close to depicting bestiality, while simultaneously veering away from such an impression by reminding his readers that this is really an anthropomorphic god in disguise."
[342] For this see Magalhães, 2015.
[343] See also *Dion.* 6.155 ff.
[344] That is indeed her main mythological function: to bear Helen, Clytemnestra and the Dioskouroi, establishing the genealogy of two of the most prominent female characters in the Greek mythological tradition.
[345] The connection between Dionysus and snakes was a widely popular literary and artistic motif in ancient times. Olympia, Alexander's mother, is probably the most famous maenad of antiquity, and Plutarch (*Alex.* 2.3-6) tells us a story of a snake sharing Olympia's bed. Alexander would later in life call himself the 'New

convey an imagery of animals having sex with humans, they are not animals but gods. Therefore, these myths do not provide us with the ancient Greek perspective on sex with animals, how it was understood by ancient Greek society or how they regulated sexual contact between humans and animals. It does reinforce the divine prominence over humans, that gods are superior to people and, therefore, a sexual liaison with a god is simply a way of fulfilling divine will, as a human should always do. These myths do not convey much information relating to the general Greek behaviour towards human animal sex, however, the same cannot be said about the myth of Pasiphae, as I explore in the next section.

3.3.2. Pasiphae

The myth of Pasiphae is particularly interesting, being different from the other myths that I have analysed in this chapter, since it shows a woman taking the sexual initiative in copulating with an animal, albeit guided by divine intervention.[346] The general lines of the myth say that Minos, wishing to rule over Crete, proclaimed that the kingdom was a divine gift for him. As proof, he asked Poseidon to send him a magnificent bull that he would then sacrifice to the god of the sea. Poseidon acquiesced to Minos' request, however the latter failed to fulfil his pledge, and instead of sacrificing the bull he chose to keep him, sacrificing a different one. Enraged, Poseidon made Pasiphae, Minos' wife, contrive a powerful passion for the bull, and to fulfil this sexual desire the queen asked for the help of Daedalus who constructed a wooden cow, where Pasiphae would hide, and so deceive the bull into penetrating her (Apollod. 3.1.4).[347] From this union Asterius, the minotaur, was born.

Dionysus', since he was able to reach India. Mark Antony a few centuries after (Plut. *Ant.* 60.3) also carried the same title. For the connection between Macedonian royalty and Bacchic rituals, see Burkert,1993: 261.

[346] On this see Alexandridis, 2008: 299.

[347] As Alexandridis (2008: 300) noted, the cow engine could be the most practical solution for attracting the bull, but it also transforms Pasiphae into a beast.

Of the myths that I have analysed in this chapter, that of Pasiphae is unique, the only one that does not fit the common structure. Contrary to what happens to Leda or Europa, where the initiative of the sexual act rests on the male figure, in the myth of Pasiphae it is the female character that takes the initiative, although this action is pushed by Poseidon's divine intervention. By mixing with an animal, Pasiphae is effectively breaking the boundaries between species, and her action is further emphasised by her 'transformation' into a cow. Contrary to Leda or Europa, who were conquered by gods, who are at the top of the natural order of the Greek world, Pasiphae was unable to control her lust for an animal, the bottom end of the natural order, and so this transgressional encounter could only result in a transgressional outcome: the minotaur. The birth of the minotaur is possibly the best example to show how the myth of Pasiphae was considered in a different light from the other myths with animal (although not human) sex elements, like the one of Leda. According to the most popular tradition, Helen resulted from the union of Zeus/swan and Leda.[348] Her birth was even animalistic, since she hatched from an egg instead of being born. Therefore, Helen shares animal characteristics, like the minotaur, but she became the most beautiful woman in the world, while the minotaur was forever a hybrid, a transgressional being that should be destroyed, as it would be at the hands of Theseus. The uniqueness of Pasiphae's situation is noted by the chorus in Euripides' *Cretans* (472e 1-3)

οὐ γάρ τιν' ἄλλην φημὶ τολμῆσαι τάδε.
σὺ †δ' ἐκ κακῶν†, ἄναξ,
φρόνησον εὖ καλύψαι.

. . . for I say that no other woman dared this.
Now you, my lord—think how to conceal
(trouble?) following trouble![349]

[348] There was also a tradition according to which Helen was the daughter of Nemesis and Zeus. For this version see Apollod. 3.10.5-7.
[349] Tr. Collard.

The rest of the chorus' speech did not survive, but we can deduce enough from the surviving lines to argue that Pasiphae's situation was unique. They refer to Pasiphae as the only woman who tried this, which is most likely a reference to the sexual act with the bull.

The difference between the myths of Pasiphae and Leda is also perceptible on an artistic level. We have several representations of the myth of Leda and the swan, where the two are represented together, sometimes kissing[350] or embracing,[351] although the sexual act is never explicitly depicted. On the other hand, representations of Pasiphae's myth are virtually non-existent in Greek art, [352] let alone representations of her alongside the bull. [353] The artistic differences in the portrayal of the myths point to different levels of acceptance of the story conveyed. Leda was taken by a god, Pasiphae was taken by an animal. Therefore, from the first union we have a godly result, and from the second a bestial one.

The lack of representations of Pasiphae contrasts with the large number of artistic depictions of her son, the minotaur. We have several representations of the minotaur in different scenarios, the most famous being the combat with Theseus, which goes back to the seventh century B.C.E.[354] I believe it is relevant to understand this difference in the number of representations. As I mentioned, the most common minotaur episode depicted

[350] See for example the fourth century B.C.E. Apulian red-figure *loutrophoros*, attributed to the Painter of the Louvre in the J. P. Getty Museum (86.AE.680).
[351] For example, a marble relief from Argos, now in the British Museum (1973,0302.1) or the famous Leda of Timotheus, of which several Roman copies survive.
[352] Among the examples provided in *LIMC*, there is the fragment of one Apulian calyx-krater (fig.4), from the middle of the fourth century B.C., and a possible representation of Pasiphae in an Attic oinochoe (fig.32). For the debate around this vase, see Papadopoulos, 1994. We only find representations of Pasiphae and the bull, or the mechanical bull, in Roman and Etruscan times.
[353] We do have references to a theatrical representation of this myth. Suetonius (*Nero* 12), tells us that Nero promoted a theatrical performance of the myth of Pasiphae, where supposedly a woman was hidden inside a cow shaped wooden image, and was penetrated by the bull. Martial (*Spect.* 5) tells us of another re-enactment of the myth. Writing at the time of the opening of the Colosseum in 80 C.E., he tells us that a woman was forced to copulate with a bull before the crowd. We have no reference to a similar event on a Greek stage, which is not a surprise since action in Greek tragedy usually takes place off stage. Euripides' play *The Cretans* was a take on this myth, however the plot most likely started with the discovery of the birth of the minotaur by Minos, and so the moment of conception would not be re-enacted. Collard et. al. (1995: 58) argues that the baby minotaur would never been shown in a tragedy.
[354] For this see Woodford (1992) and Bazant (1992).

in artistic representations is his slaying at the hands of Theseus. Therefore, in this case, the most common representation equals the most relevant episode of the mythological path of the minotaur, simultaneously being one of the main episodes of the mythological cycle of Theseus. When we consider Pasiphae, the most relevant episode of her mythological cycle is her passion for the bull and the consequent birth of the minotaur. The relevance of this episode is so great that we do not have any hint of her fate after that point. However, contrary to what happens with her son, she, and the most relevant episode of her mythological cycle, the copulation with the bull, are never represented. This anxiety in representing the union of Pasiphae and the bull goes hand in hand with the popularity of the representation of the destruction of the minotaur at the hands of Theseus.[355] With the killing of the minotaur, the embodiment of the unrestrained lust of a woman, the world falls back into its natural order. The fact that Ariadne, the daughter of Minos and Pasiphae, helps Theseus in this quest reinforces this necessity to correct the situation.[356] The legitimate daughter of Pasiphae provides crucial help to purge her mother's mistake.

This discrepancy in the number of representations becomes even clearer when we look at the case of Europa, a mythological figure that shares some of the traits of the myth of Pasiphae: both are queens of Crete and both share a sexual connection with a bull (or Zeus in a bull-shaped form).[357] However, the nature and consequences of their passion for an animal are quite different. Europa gave birth to sons that would eventually become heroes, while Pasiphae gave birth to a hybrid creature. The difference rests in the animal. The bull in the myth of Europa was a god in disguise, while the bull in Pasiphae's myth

[355] See, for example, the sixth century B.C.E. Attic black-figure amphora in the J. P. Getty Museum (85.AE.376) or the early fifth century B.C.E. Attic red-figure stamnos in the British Museum (1866,0805.2).
[356] On this see Robson, 2002: 80-81.
[357] Andrews (1969: 60) finds the myths so alike, that he even states that "it is evident at once that Europa and Pasiphae are doublets; each is a queen of Crete who mates with a divine bull and bears a son called Mino". Similarities between Pasiphae and Europa were also considered by Burkert, 1983: 77.

was indeed an animal.[358] Therefore, as I already noted in the comparison with the myth of Leda, from copulating with an animal-shaped god we have a divine outcome; from copulating with an actual animal we have a bestial outcome. And this difference is nowhere so attested as in art. Most of the representations of Europa show her either seated on top of the bull, or next to him.[359] In my opinion, this remarkable difference between the depictions of Pasiphae and Europa, two mythological figures with extremely similar mythological narratives, is due to the sexual act that was committed. Europa developed a passion for Zeus, and Pasiphae a passion for an animal.

Pasiphae's sexual transgression might have been considered too explicit for iconographic depictions, but it might have been more approachable by comedy. There were several comedies that dealt with the Cretan cycle,[360] but the one that the most likely approached the episode of Pasiphae and the bull was Alcaeus' *Pasiphae*, produced in 388 B.C., under the archonship of Antipater, where it competed against Aristophanes' *Wealth*. The surviving three lines of the comedy do not disclose anything about the plot, but it is fair to assume that this myth could be adapted due to its potential for crude humour and sexual puns.

Therefore, we should consider whether the minotaur is a punishment for Pasiphae's lust. Robson (2002: 81) argues that myths such as this show what happens to women when they cannot control their sexual desires. According to him, "Female passion is always punished", and so these myths also have the effect of regulating the normative female sexual behaviour. Alexandridis (2008: 300), when discussing this myth, notes that

[358] Buxton (2009: 160) also made a reference to this difference: "Pasiphae, by contrast [to Europa], is a married woman whose desire for the unusual is at the same time a rejection of her husband Minos. Moreover, the bull she longs for lacks the crucial quality of Europa's partner: it is not a transformed Olympian divinity. The fact that Pasiphae has transgressed is spelled out in the language of genealogy: her offspring is the hybrid Minotaur. Europa's act is quite different: Zeus' metamorphosis places their union within a sanctioning, normalizing framework, which is confirmed when Europa gives birth to the three unmonstrous heroes of Crete".

[359] Of the two hundred and twenty-six iconographical representations of the myth of Europa listed in *LIMC*, two hundred and ten depict her and the bull in either of these positions.

[360] Papadopoulos, 1994: 193. Among them, two comedies entitled *The Cretans*, by Apollophanes and Nicochares; four *Daedalos*, by Plato, Aristophanes, Philippos and Euboulos; two *Minos*, by Antiphanes and Alexis, and the above mentioned *Pasiphae* by Alcaeus.

the union of a woman and an animal was a problematic idea for the ancient Greeks, and that the minotaur is the punishment for Pasiphae's inter-species transgression. In a similar vein, I believe the myth of Pasiphae is an example of the anxiety that the ancient Greeks felt when considering human-animal sexual relations, and more specifically woman-animal sex, and that part of its function is to convey the negative connotations of the sexual activity. However, the real scope of the myth goes beyond the sexual transgression, also, and possibly more importantly, conveying a case of disrespect for the gods. The minotaur is the natural consequence of the sexual transgression, but this transgression only took place as punishment for Minos' disregard of his promise to Poseidon. This is indeed what we can deduce from Euripides' dramatization of the myth in the *Cretans* (fr. 472e). When trying to defend herself from Minos' accusations of adultery (5ff.), Pasiphae argues her lustful madness was provoked by a god (ἐκ θεοῦ γὰρ προσβολῆς ἐμηνάμην), and so she was a hostage to fortune. She then turns to her accuser, her husband, stating that the real culprit was him, because he did not fulfil his pledge to Poseidon. Pasiphae argues that Poseidon exacted punishment on Minos through her (25-26. ἐκ τῶνδέ τοί σ' ὑπῆλθ[ε κἀ]πετείσ[ατο δίκην Ποσειδῶν, ἐς δ' ἔμ' ἔσκηψ[εν νόσον), making Minos the cause of her shame.[361] Minos is Poseidon's real target, and forcing his wife to have sex with an animal, transgressing the boundaries between species, and consequently giving birth to the embodiment of the transgression, a hybrid creature that is half human, half bull, is Minos' real punishment.[362]

There is a parallel between Pasiphae's speech and Helen's in the *Trojan Women* (914-965). When facing Menelaus for the first time since before the war, Helen is aware that she is about to be sentenced to die by her first husband. In the final attempt to save her life, she tries to argue the reasons why she does not deserve to die. The first, like

[361] Sansone (2013: 58-65) noted that Pasiphae's apology has two parts: the first where she argues that she is not to blame, but rather the gods; and the second where she accuses Minos of being the actual culprit.
[362] For this play, see Cantarella, 1964, Collard, et. al. 1995.

Pasiphae's, is an argument based on divine superiority over humans: it was Aphrodite who promised her to Paris to win the golden apple. She then snaps at Menelaus (ὦ κάκιστε) accusing him of leaving her alone in Sparta, giving Paris the opportunity to kidnap her. Both women committed transgressions (breaking of marriage vows/copulating with an animal), both actions triggered terrible outcomes (the Trojan war/the birth of the minotaur), however they were both compelled by a superior force (Aphrodite/Poseidon).

In conclusion, we should consider whether these myths reflect sexual practices that the ancient Greeks understood as transgressions. Robson (2002: 67) argues, albeit carefully, that it is possible that these myths might be somewhat related with both sexual fantasy and sexual practice in ancient Greece. Robson is right, in my opinion, although we should keep in mind that the animal sex seems to not have been a common motif of these myths in the earlier sources. Most ancient accounts of these myths do not disclose the animal element, which shows a thematical change in the Greek mythological *corpus* through the centuries. Despite the myths of Leda and Europa being already known in Homer, there is no reference to animal sex. We find the first references to these versions in tragedy. Therefore, although it became a common motif of the later mythological *corpus*, the concept of sex between human and animal-shaped gods seems not to have been the most relevant motif in the oldest surviving sources.

Second, the majority of these myths do not show sex between animals and humans, but rather gods in animal shape. It is not a category of living beings that would be considered sub-human, but rather the contrary.[363] The capacity to transform one's shape is already a display of power and general superiority of deities over humans. These myths do not regulate the social reaction to human-animal sex, since gods are not restrained by human laws and customs. A mortal man has no capacity to punish a god.

[363] Robson (2002: 77) points out that these rapes are only committed by gods who are symbols of civilisation, and that is why Dionysus is never the perpetrator.

The action in this typology of myths occurs in the wild, outside of the city borders, a place where the girl was not supposed to be, since she was not protected by the walls of her house, or within the reach of her male guardian. It is not only that gods are not liable to human law, but also that these girls, in some of the myths that were approached in this chapter, are presented in a scenario outside the scope of the city's law. Therefore, not all myths that convey episodes of sexual intercourse between humans and animals, simultaneously convey the social perception of human-animal sex. They do however, all reinforce the place of humans in relation to the divine.[364] The myth of Pasiphae, on the other hand, shows that the act of human-animal sex is portrayed with negative overtones when it is a human, and more specifically a woman, taking the initiative. Although in this case the animal is not a god in disguise, the myth only unrolls due to divine intervention. Therefore, we can argue that the transgressive character of human-animal sex in myth is also decided by the gods.[365]

Of the myths explored in this chapter, the one of Pasiphae is unique, not fitting the general structure. It is, from a general point of view, a tale of punishment of a man's disrespect towards a god. Pasiphae's arguments in Euripides' *The Cretans* are valid: she was compelled by divine intention that was itself motivated by her husband's transgressions. Poseidon chooses to use Pasiphae to punish Minos, punishing through an act of human-animal sex. Through an unnatural act, an unnatural creature is born. The minotaur is the embodiment of the transgression, a creature that would never exist if Minos had sacrificed the bull, that would eventually become the father of the minotaur, to Poseidon. However, I think that the myth also conveys what most likely was the social reaction towards human-animal sex. The surviving lines from the *Cretans* seem to imply

[364] As Robson (2002: 82) notes, these myths "help to define and uphold both the institutions of the city-state and the Greek world order", namely "[…] (i) men's superiority to women, (ii) women's role in society, and (iii) the place of human in relation to the gods".
[365] As Alexandridis (2008: 303) puts it, when a god loves, he often chooses the form of an animal as his epiphany, but when a god punishes, the sexual union of man and animal becomes humiliation and the fruit of that relationship becomes a monster.

this. The chorus states that no other woman ever dared to do such a deed. Pasiphae names (fr. 472e. 12) her lust for the bull a "shameful disease" (αἰσχίστῃ νόσῳ), and this lust, although not her fault but rather the fault of her husband, destroyed (ἀπόλλυμι) her.

This is also evidenced by the lack of depictions of Pasiphae, contrary to what we can attest for Leda and Europa, who are constantly represented by the swan and the bull, respectively. There seems to be a conscious avoidance of the representation of this myth by Greek artists, which might hint at a certain anxiety about representing a sexual connection that was socially reproachable. We can establish a parallel with the lack of representation of explicit sexual intercourse between a man and a boy in pederastic vases. Although we have evidence to suppose that anal sex could happen, there is a clear anxiety in portraying a sexual act that would provoke social disapproval. In this particular case, the lack of representation of Pasiphae and the bull is contraposed by the wealth of representations of Europa and the bull, as well as representations of the death of the minotaur. By killing the beast, the embodiment of this transgression against nature, Theseus re-establishes the natural order of the world. I am, in no way, arguing that the reason why the killing of the minotaur became a famous iconographical motif in ancient Greece is because of the need to rectify the sexual transgression that preceded his birth. Theseus was an important and celebrated hero of Athenian culture; therefore, the episodes of its mythological cycle were always going to be adapted. However, it is nonetheless true that almost every representation of the minotaur depicts it either fighting, attempting to flee or being killed by Theseus. There is no Greek representation of its birth, and almost nothing of its mother. I do not think that Pasiphae was involuntarily removed from Greek artistic representations,[366] but it is rather a conscious option, that most likely rests on the unnatural act conveyed in the myth. This argument, I believe, is strengthened by the

[366] Pausanias (3.26.1) mentions that there were bronze statues of Pasiphae and of Helios in a sanctuary of Io, in Laconia. There is, nonetheless, no reference to any trace that could link those statues to the episode of the minotaur.

wealth of representations of Europa with the bull. Europa, a mythological figure whose narrative is, in many details, similar to Pasiphae's, is freely represented with the animal-shaped Zeus, while Pasiphae is almost completely absent from Greek art. When painting Europa, they were celebrating Zeus, but when representing Pasiphae, they were just remembering the transgressive spirit of a woman who could not resist her lust for an animal. I further explore the artistic representations of sex between humans and animals in the next section.

3.4. Art

Despite the multitude of myths that convey stories of gods having sex with females in the form of animals, the actual sexual intercourse is never depicted. We do not have depictions of Zeus having intercourse with Europa or Persephone, nor of the bull copulating with Pasiphae. We do have a considerable amount of representations of satyrs, pursuing maenads, trying to rape them or having sex with animals such as deer and donkeys, or even objects such as amphoras[367]. Satyrs are, by definition, transgressive creatures. They still have partially human anatomy, but are always represented with animal characteristics, such as tail, horns and hooves.[368] Their 'bestiality' is also emphasised by their lack of self-control, noted by being in a quasi-permanent state of erection, their constant connection to wine, and their sexual advances on maenads and animals.[369] The possible connection between the representation of satyrs and human

[367] See Lissarrague, 1990.
[368] As Lissarrague (1990: 54) noted, the accentuation, or non-accentuation, is 'not a simple iconographic evolution. The painters may choose at any time to accentuate the satyr's animal character by modifying his anatomy, or they may bring together different types of satyr, playing on the varying degrees of the satyrs' humanity'.
[369] The sexual lust of satyrs is well attested in ancient Greek culture. For example, the earliest surviving reference of satyrs is ancient Greek literature is of them making love with nymphs in caves (Hymn. Hom. *Ven*. 262–3).

sexuality is, I believe, well grasped by Robson (2002: 66), when he states that "Satyrs are sexually transgressive by nature and so are often employed by vase painters to depict behaviour that is of marginal acceptability for humans".

I wish, nonetheless, to explore the few representations of humans and animals engaging in sexual intercourse. In an Attic black-figured lekythos, a man is depicted while penetrating a doe.[370] It is quite similar to another representation, in a vase from 560 B.C.E. (Dierichs, 2008: 126), now in the Archaeological Museum of Thebes (3691), where once again we have the representation of a man copulating with a doe. I believe there is a connection between these representations and the representations of satyrs having sex with animals. The two vases that I have mentioned where a man is penetrating a doe carry clear artistic similarities with representations of satyrs copulating with animals.[371] Both aggressors are represented holding the animal from behind, seeking to copulate *a tergo*. The similarity between satyrs and men in these representations hints at the transgressional character of their behaviour. This seems to have been also noted by Keuls (1985: 179), who argues that the motif of copulation with animals is "the topic of several coarse pictorial jokes indirectly implying reproof". She also notes that this motif usually entails satyrs, but in some cases, we do have representations of men copulating with animals, once again emphasising the artistic analogy between satyr transgressional behaviour, and human transgressional behaviour by association.

The most discussed representation among this typology of representations is on a red-figure cup by Epiktetos, now in the National Museum of Naples (27.669), from the last quarter of the sixth century B.C.E., where a woman lies on her back, holding a wine-cup, making herself available to an aroused donkey.[372] There are different opinions

[370] Keuls (1985: fig.161). Keuls does not give much information about the vase, apart from the fact that it was part of a private collection in Munich.
[371] See for example fig. 87 in Dierichs (2008: 127) and figures 2.19, 2.20 and 2.21 in Lissarrague (1990: 76-77).
[372] Juvenal (6.333) satirises a woman for being penetrated by a donkey. Sex with a donkey is also narrated in Apuleius.

concerning the identity of the woman. Johns (1982: 111) states that she is a maenad, establishing a connection between the woman, the donkey and the illustration on the back of the vase, where a satyr is pursuing another woman. The inclusion of traditional Dionysiac elements, such as the donkey and the satyr, might indeed point to the identity of the woman as a maenad, although the inclusion of a donkey instead of a satyr as the woman's sexual partner seems to be an innovation within the genre. Lissarrague (1990: 64; 80) argues that the women on both sides of the vase are hetairas, and not maenads[373]. According to him, the only element that attests the women's status is the skyphos placed on the ground in front of the woman who is being chased by the satyr that Lissarrague reads as a clear reference to the symposium. He relates this painting to other vases where sex between satyrs and donkeys is attested,[374] establishing a previous connection between the two creatures, arguing that, in this case, the donkey replaces the satyr.

I believe Lissarrague's argument is partially right. I think that he is right when affirming that the donkey replaces the satyr as the male sexual subject. However, I think he is wrong in considering that it is a hetaira instead of a maenad. Despite making a brief reference to the thyrsus that the female figure is holding in her right hand, while holding the wine-cup in her left, Lissarrague does not attribute any relevance to that element. The presence of the thyrsus, in my opinion, reemphasises the connection between the scene and Dionysian mythology, strongly hinting that the woman is indeed a maenad. A hetaira would not typically be linked with a thyrsus. The painting is, nevertheless, certainly a representation of a transgression. As Lissarrague noted, the ithyphallic donkey, represented as the male sexual partner, replaces the satyr as the transgressive element of the scene. The presence of the satyr, who is pursuing a woman, on the other side of the vase does reinforce the interchangeable motif between animal and hybrid creature, further emphasising the transgressive aspect of the representation. It should be noted that neither

[373] Keuls (1985: 165) also argues that the female is a hetaira, however she does not add much on this subject.
[374] See fig. 2.21; 2.22 in Lissarrague's paper (p.77).

the donkey nor the satyr actually penetrates the woman. The satyr is pursuing the woman, trying to penetrate her from behind while she tries to escape. It is a scenario of rape. However, the donkey is not trying to rape the maenad, but is being invited by her. She is in a reclined position, with her legs opened, offering both wine and sex to the animal. The fact that the consummation of the animal sex scenario is not represented might indicate the painter's will to refrain from painting an even more transgressive, scandalous image. I have already noted that, in the myth of Pasiphae, she is never represented with the bull, let alone engaging in sexual intercourse, a possible sign that sex with an animal, and specifically a woman having sex with an animal, could be considered a transgression that should not be displayed in any way.[375]

These images show that ancient painters felt much more comfortable using satyrs in depictions of sex with animals, instead of humans. We do have two vases where it is a man, and not a satyr, who is penetrating the animal, however they are painted in a similar manner to satyrs in the same act. The satyr is an easy solution to approach human-animal sex in an artistic manner, since they are part-human creatures (in some representations they only clearly differ from a man because of the tail) who embody the concept of transgression. They are the union of two different species, who constantly show the lack of capacity to self-control (their animal side), permanently aroused and constantly engaging in inter-species sex. They are visual testimonies that sex with animals was part of Greek *imaginarium*, but simultaneously show that it was an act only acceptable for hybrid creatures.[376]

[375]A much later artefact (251-310), a lamp produced in Athens (BM Q3271) is decorated with a discus where a horse is copulating with a woman on a bed, with a jug and a drinking cup on their side. The representation is particularly interesting because of its domestic setting, the bedroom, where the horse assumes the position of a man, becoming the woman's lawful lover.

[376] The artistic anxiety in representing scenes of human-animal sex is even more aggravated when the human subject is female. That is, in my opinion, better demonstrated by the already mentioned lack of representation of the myth of Pasiphae, which contrasts with the wealth of representation of the killing of the minotaur.

3.5. Non-mythological sources

Up to this point, we have seen that sex between animals and humans was approached in the myth of Pasiphae, and how this myth conveys the transgressive character of the action. I have argued that this is the reason why Pasiphae disappeared from the Greek artistic culture. In this section, I want to explore several texts where human-animal sex was, in some way, approached. As becomes clear, in all of these passages it is possible to perceive that human-animal sex was generally considered a negative, transgressive sexual behaviour, a sexual act against nature, as Artemidorus said.

Herodotus (2.46), when providing discussing manners and customs of the Egyptians, narrates a peculiar ritual that took place in the Mendesian province:

> […] τὸν Πᾶνα τῶν ὀκτὼ θεῶν λογίζονται εἶναι οἱ Μενδήσιοι, τοὺς δὲ ὀκτὼ θεοὺς τούτους προτέρους τῶν δυώδεκα θεῶν φασι γενέσθαι. γράφουσί τε δὴ καὶ γλύφουσι οἱ ζωγράφοι καὶ οἱ ἀγαλματοποιοὶ τοῦ Πανὸς τῶγαλμα κατά περ Ἕλληνες αἰγοπρόσωπον καὶ τραγοσκελέα, οὔτι τοιοῦτον νομίζοντες εἶναί μιν ἀλλὰ ὁμοῖον τοῖσι ἄλλοισι θεοῖσι· ὅτευ δὲ εἵνεκα τοιοῦτον γράφουσι αὐτόν, οὔ μοι ἥδιον ἐστὶ λέγειν. σέβονται δὲ πάντας τοὺς αἶγας οἱ Μενδήσιοι, καὶ μᾶλλον τοὺς ἔρσενας τῶν θηλέων, καὶ τούτων οἱ αἰπόλοι τιμὰς μέζονας ἔχουσι· ἐκ δὲ τούτων ἕνα μάλιστα, ὅστις ἐπεὰν ἀποθάνῃ, πένθος μέγα παντὶ τῷ Μενδησίῳ νομῷ τίθεται. καλέεται δὲ ὅ τε τράγος καὶ ὁ Πὰν Αἰγυπτιστὶ Μένδης. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ νομῷ τούτῳ ἐπ᾽ ἐμεῦ τοῦτο τὸ τέρας· γυναικὶ τράγος ἐμίσγετο ἀναφανδόν. τοῦτο ἐς ἐπίδεξιν ἀνθρώπων ἀπίκετο.
>
> […] the Mendesians reckon Pan among the eight gods, who, they say, were before the twelve gods. Now in their painting and sculpture the image of Pan is made as among the Greeks with the head and the legs of a goat; not that he is deemed to be in truth such, or unlike to other gods; but why they so present him I have no wish to say. The Mendesians hold all goats sacred, the male even more than the female, and goatherds are held in especial honour: one he-goat is most sacred of all; when he dies it is ordained that there should be great mourning in all the Mendesian province. In the Egyptian language Mendes is the name both for the he-goat and for Pan. In my lifetime a monstrous thing happened in this province, a woman having open intercourse with a he-goat. This came to be publicly known.[377]

This practice among the Mendesians was also mentioned by Pindar, according to Strabo (16.19):[378]

[377] Tr. Godley.
[378] Cf. Aristides *Or.* 36.112 and Clement *Protr.* 2.32.4 which also mention the sexual act with a goat in Mendes. See Lloyd (2007: 270).

Ἐν δὲ τῇ μεσογείῳ τῇ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Σεβεννυτικοῦ καὶ Φατνιτικοῦ στόματος Ξόις ἐστὶ καὶ νῆσος καὶ πόλις ἐν τῷ Σεβεννυτικῷ νομῷ. ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ἑρμοῦ πόλις καὶ Λύκου πόλις καὶ Μένδης, ὅπου τὸν Πᾶνα τιμῶσι καὶ τῶν ζῴων τράγον· ὡς δὲ Πίνδαρός φησιν, οἱ τράγοι ἐνταῦθα γυναιξὶ μίγνυνται·
Μένδητα παρὰ κρημνὸν θαλάσσης, ἔσχατον Νείλου κέρας, αἰγιβάται ὅθι τράγοι γυναιξὶ μίσγονται.

In the interior above the Sebennytic and Phatnitic mouths lies Xoïs, both an island and a city, in the Sebennytic Nome. Here, also, are an Hermupolis and a Lycupolis, and Mendes, at which place they worship Pan and, among animals, a he-goat; and, as Pindar says, the he-goats have intercourse with women there: "Mendes, along the crag of the sea, farthermost horn of the Nile, where the goat-mounting he-goats have intercourse with women."[379]

Strabo does not disclose anything else on this practice, nor does he report anything else of Pindar's observations. Herodotus also does not convey much, but he seems to provide his own reaction to the act. He states that in the province, the goat, and especially the male goat, was a sacred animal due to its association with the god Pan.[380] Then he proceeds to convey a scandalous story: it was publicly known that there had occurred a ritual in which a woman copulated with a male goat. Herodotus deems this a monstrosity (τέρας), further explaining that it was a recent event that happened in his lifetime.

This reference by Herodotus is not the only one with the implactions of sex between humans and goats. We also find it in third century B.C.E. bucolic literature, in the idylls of Theocritus. In the song of Thyrsis,[381] in Theocritus' first *Idyll* (1.86), sex between goatherds and their goats seems to be implied.[382] In this text, a shepherd named Thyrsis and an unnamed goatherd meet in the pastures. After extensively complimenting each other on their musical qualities, the goatherd convices Thyrsis to sing him the song about the death of Daphnis, in exchange for a cup that he describes in detail. In this song, Daphnis, a Sicilian shepherd, supposedly offended Eros and Aphrodite and as punishment he became obsessed with love and consequently died. The reason for angering the gods is not clear in Theocritus' version, nor the circumstances of Daphnis' death.[383] The song

[379] Tr. Leonard Jones.
[380] As Lloyd (2007: 270) notes, the god Mendes is almost always represented as a ram, but Herodotus refers to a goat.
[381] For the love of Daphnis in this text, see Anagnostou-Laoutides, Konstan, 2008.
[382] As Samson (2013: 297) notes: "Bestiality is never overt in Theocritus' *Idylls*; however, his characters are certainly aware of the stereotype that herdsman perform bestial acts with their animals.".
[383] The myth of Daphnis seems to have been known at least since the time of Stesichorus of Himera (sixth century B.C.E.). For the tradition of the myth of Daphnis, see Ogilvie, 1962.

opens with Daphnis, tormented by love, being visited by Hermes and then Priapus. Both question Daphnis, but he refuses to reply. When commenting on this obsession with love, the god Priapus compares Daphnis to a goatherd, stating that when goatherds see goats being mounted (βατεῦνται), they get sad, wishing to be a goat instead of a man:

ἦνθον τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες, ᾠπόλοι ἦνθον·
πάντες ἀνηρώτευν τί πάθοι κακόν. ἦνθ' ὁ Πρίηπος
κἤφα "Δάφνι τάλαν, τί τὺ τάκεαι; ἁ δέ τυ κώρα
πάσας ἀνὰ κράνας, πάντ' ἄλσεα ποσσὶ φορεῖται -
ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς -
ζάτεισ'· ἦ δύσερώς τις ἄγαν καὶ ἀμήχανος ἐσσί.
βούτας μὲν ἐλέγευ, νῦν δ' αἰπόλῳ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας.
ᾠπόλος, ὅκκ' ἐσορῇ τὰς μηκάδας οἷα βατεῦνται,
τάκεται ὀφθαλμὼς ὅτι οὐ τράγος αὐτὸς ἔγεντο.
ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς.
καὶ τὺ δ' ἐπεί κ' ἐσορῇς τὰς παρθένος οἷα γελᾶντι,
τάκεαι ὀφθαλμὼς ὅτι οὐ μετὰ ταῖσι χορεύεις."

The oxherds came, the shepherds and the goatherds came, and they all asked what was troubling him. Priapus came, and said, "Poor Daphnis, why are you pining away? The girl is wandering by every spring and every grove -
Begin, dear Muses, begin the pastoral song -
"searching for you. Ah, you are simply a hopeless lover and quite at a loss what to do. You used to be called an oxherd, but now you are acting like a goatherd. When he sees the nanny goats being mounted, the goatherd weeps his eyes away regretting that he wasn't born a goat.
Begin, dear Muses, begin the pastoral song.
"And you, when you see how the girls laugh, weep your eyes away just because you're not dancing with them."[384]

Priapus' speech seems to be offensive towards Daphnis. He starts by emphasising Daphnis' suffering state (Δάφνι τάλαν), and then informs Daphnis that there is a girl/nymph (κώρα) looking for him. We do not know exactly who this girl is. Ogilvie (1962: 108) argues that this *kōra* should be the one that Daphnis is longing for, however, since Theocritus uses this term both for nymphs and maidens, we cannot be sure of the status of Daphnis' beloved. Gutzwiller (1991: 97) also argues that this *kōra* is the one that Daphnis loves, and that he is simply resisting the erotic urge.[385] Dover (1971: 84)

[384] Tr. Hopkinson.
[385] For more on this, see Gutzwiller, 1991: 95-101.

proposes different possibilities for this resistance: Daphnis could have been punished by some god and become impotent, or is being threatened by a god with punishment in case he has sex with the girl, or he boasted that he was immune to Eros, and so is now afraid of the consequences if he breaks his vow.

In the face of Daphnis' apathy over the possibility of enjoying the company of the girl, Priapus calls him "obsessed with passion" (δύσερως),[386] making the reader aware that Daphnis longed for someone, and "helpless" (ἀμήχανος), emphasising his incapacity to gratify his passion.[387] Priapus further adds that Daphnis reminds him of the goatherd who sadly looks at his goats being mounted, sad because he is not a goat himself. What is Priapus really implying here? Gutzwiller (1991:98) argues that the relationship established between the goatherd and Daphnis is a reference to the sexual freedom of the natural world, which the goatherd sees as preferable to the restraints of human relationships. Samson (2013: 297) similarly argues that the goatherd might be "only weeping in envy of their sexual freedom", but, contrary to Gutzwiller and Hunter, she poses another possibility: what if the goatherd is weeping because of an erotic feeling towards the goat? Gow (1950: 20) had already noticed goatherds might have been known for their proclivity to sexual excesses.[388] White (2004: 152) notes that Theocritus employed a sexual pun by using the verb *elaunō* (ἐλαύνω) (89), which can mean "drive" but also *bīneō* (βῑνέω), "illicit intercourse".[389] In her opinion, Theocritus is actively implying that the goatherd is interested in engaging in sexual intercourse with the goats. This seems to be in line with the scholiast on Theocritus (86), who implies that goatherds

[386] On the meanings of this term, see Ogilvie, 1962: 107-108.
[387] On this passage, see Gutzwiller, 1991: 98. For As Hunter (1999: 92) notes, there is a parallel here with Polyphemos and Galateia, established by the usage of the term *dyserōs*: "Galateia is alleged to flirt with Polyphemos and call him δυσέρωτα καὶ αἰπόλον; that song assumes a situation in which Polyphemos could have Galateia but holds back. So here, Priapos probably considers Daphnis δύσερως, 'preverse with regard to love', because he is not taking an easy opportunity."
[388] Although partially agreeing with Gow's arguments, Giangrande (1977: 179-180) points out some errors in them. Gow thinks that the reason for the herdsmen's devious sexuality is due to their being embarrassed in their relationships with women. Giangrande shows that herdsmen were certainly sexually interested in women, and the reason why they might sexually use animals is the lack of access to women.
[389] Hunter (1999: 112) also notes that *elaunō* is a "not uncommon vulgarism with sexual sense". For more on the meaning of *elaunō*, see White, 1986.

are more prone to lust than cowherds, because the goats provoke them, while cows do not. Similar, Hunter (1999: 93) argues that Priapus' "point may be that the goatherd is δύσερως because, although having in his (female) goats a ready supply of outlets for desire, he longs for the impossible (transformation into a he-goat) rather than merely doing what a Priapos would do to the nearest available she-goat".

I do believe that a certain erotisation of the animal exists here. It is not a coincidence that the character that makes the sexual allusion is Priapus, a god that symbolises permanent lust that is commonly associated with Pan and satyrs, mythological figures that often engage in transgressional sexual behaviour. The god's comment is intended to taunt Daphnis, downgrading Daphnis from cowherd to goatherd, which was considered a lower class of herdsmen,[390] and furthermore comparing him to the goatherds who fantasise about sexual intercourse with their goats. Priapus does seem to imply that it would be common for goatherds to use their animals sexually, and the scholiast on Theocritus further justifies this implication. Theocritus adds to the reputation of the herdsmen's uncontrollable sexual desires. As Giangrande (1977: 179) notices, the reason for this reputation is due to the demands of their profession, that "took them away from the opposite sex (they had to spend their lives tending herds on solitary hills) so that their sexual energy was pent-up and explosive". Furthermore, Theocritus' choice of words, as noted by White, can be read as a sexual pun, further implying the sexual connection between man and animal. In this particular case, it is noted that the kind of herdsman more prone to engage in sexual intercourse with an animal is the one that was considered of lower social status. Goatherds were considered an inferior class of herdsman, especially when comparing them to cowherds, and the transgressional sexual act is associated with the lower social status.

[390] Gow, 1950: 20. For a detailed analysis of this passage, see Williams, 1969. On the herdsman in ancient Greek culture, see Gutzwiller, 2006.

The allusion to sexual desire between man and animal, specifically goats in a rural scenario, is also made in a later epigram by Meleager (*A.P.* 12.41):

Οὐκέτι μοι Θήρων γράφεται καλός, οὐδ᾽ ὁ πυραυγὴς
πρίν ποτε, νῦν δ᾽ ἤδη δαλός, Ἀπολλόδοτος.
στέργω θῆλυν ἔρωτα· δασυτρώγλων δὲ πίεσμα
λασταύρων μελέτω ποιμέσιν αἰγοβάταις.

I do not count Thero fair any longer, nor Apollodotus,
once gleaming like fire, but now already a burnt-out torch.
I care for the love of women. Let it be for goat-mounting herds
to press in their arms hairy pansy-boys.[391]

Meleager writes that he no longer has interest in boys, such as Thero and Apollodotus, that he once fancied, and the source for such a lack of interest might be that they are now too old, too hairy. Since these hairy boys are no longer attractive, they should only pique the interest of herdsmen who have sex with goats (αἰγοβάταις), who are more used to hairy partners.[392] There is a clear parallel here with Theocritus.[393] Although Meleager refers to *poimēn* (ποιμήν), a "herdsman" that could deal both in cows or goats (contrary to Theocritus who refers specifically to *aipolos* (αἴπολος), a "goatherd"), he specifically mentions herdsmen who mount goats (αἰγοβάταις). Both texts not only allude to the sexual use of animals by men, but specifically the use of goats by their goatherd. They both reflect a possible social stigma towards goatherds, further emphasised by the comment of the scholiast on Theocritus that highlights how goats provoke their keepers, in contrast with cows that are more controlled creatures.

There is also a comparison to be made with myths where sex between humans and animals is portrayed. As I have already shown, this typology of myths commonly shows a maiden outside the city's boundaries, in the wild, falling outside the scope of social regulations and conventions. The herdsman/shepherd daily delves into the wilds, possibly

[391] Tr. Paton.
[392] It is also an association between goatherds and the god Pan, who is also called *Aigibatēs* (*A.P.* 6.31).
[393] This parallel was also noted by Giangrande (1977: 179-180) and White (1986: 148).

alone or with a colleague,[394] besides sharing the company of animals for long hours, every day. They most likely spend more time with animals than they do with actual people, having plenty of opportunity to satisfy a sexual desire for an animal without suffering any consequences. Modern studies also corroborate the idea that episodes of sex with animals are more common in rural areas. Already in 1948, Kinsey[395] argued that sexual contact between humans and animals was almost solely confined to rural areas, and his data revealed that seventeen percent of farm boys have "complete sexual relations with other animals, and perhaps as many more have relations which are not carried through climax".[396] The available testimonies of persons that disclose their sexual desires for animals, show that some of the most common targeted animals are horses and cows, both animals more easily found in rural areas.[397] The allusions to sex between goatherds and goats in both Theocritus and Meleager point to a similar conclusion. It is likely that in antiquity, like today, sex with animals might be more common in rural areas of Greece, since there would be privileged access to animals.

Another interesting source for this subject is Plutarch. He wrote extensively about animals, namely three different treatises solely devoted to animal questions, besides including discussions of animals in other texts.[398] For the purposes of this chapter, I will only focus on one of these texts, the already mentioned *Bruta animalia ratione uti*, also known as Gryllus.[399] The text is a parody of the tenth book of the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus, stuck on Circe's island, asks the sorcerer to transform his comrades back into men. Here, Circe acquiesces to Odysseus' request, with one condition: he first needs to discuss with his pig-shaped friends if they choose to be men again, and for the sake of

[394] In the *Iliad* (18.525-6), Hephaestus includes two shepherds on the shield of Achilles.
[395] Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin (1948: 261-262), See also Masters, 1962: 5 ff.
[396] Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin (1948: 459-463). However, after observing that urban boys also show a great sexual interest in animals, the report concluded that the only reason why sex with animals was more common in rural areas than urban was that there was more opportunity.
[397] See, for example, Earls and Lalumière (2009); Miletski (2002); Miletski (2017).
[398] For a general view of the relevance of animals in Plutarch's writings see the introduction in Newmyer, 2006, and Newmyer, 2014.
[399] This name comes from one of Odysseus' comrades who is transformed into a pig by Circe, and is one of the speakers in the text.

discussion they choose one pig, Gryllus, to convey the group's choice. Gryllus' position is clear through the entire text: animals are superior to humans (987b), sharing all the human virtues without partaking in any of the flaws and vices. Among those virtues, Gryllus mentions courage (ἀνδρεία)[400] (animals only know how to fight honourably, contrary to men and specifically Odysseus) and soundness of mind (σωφροσύνη).[401] Among the examples Gryllus uses to sustain his arguments of animals' *sōphrosynē*, which he defines as self-control, the capacity to indulge in essential desires, eliminating the need for superfluous, non-essential urges, he provides the following one (990f):

τὰ δ᾽ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀκόλαστα οὐδὲ τὸν νόμον ἔχουσα σύμμαχον ἡ φύσις ἐντὸς ὅρων καθείργνυσιν, ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ ὑπὸ ῥεύματος ἐκφερόμενα πολλαχοῦ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις δεινὴν ὕβριν καὶ ταραχὴν καὶ σύγχυσιν ἐν τοῖς ἀφροδισίοις ἀπεργάζεται τῆς φύσεως. καὶ γὰρ αἰγῶν ἐπειράθησαν ἄνδρες καὶ ὑῶν καὶ ἵππων μιγνύμενοι καὶ γυναῖκες ἄρρεσι θηρίοις ἐπεμάνησαν· ἐκ γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων γάμων ὑμῖν Μινώταυροι καὶ Αἰγίπανες, ὡς δ᾽ ἐγῷμαι καὶ Σφίγγες ἀναβλαστάνουσι καὶ Κένταυροι. καίτοι διὰ λιμόν ποτ᾽ ἀνθρώπου καὶ κύων ἔφαγεν καὶ ὑπ᾽ ἀνάγκης ὄρνις ἀπεγεύσατο· πρὸς δὲ συνουσίαν οὐδέποτε θηρίον ἐπεχείρησεν ἀνθρώπῳ χρήσασθαι. θηρία δ᾽ ἄνθρωποι καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ πρὸς ἄλλα πολλὰ καθ᾽ ἡδονὰς βιάζονται καὶ παρανομοῦσιν.

Not even Nature, with Law for her ally, can keep within bounds the unchastened vice of your [men] hearts; but as though swept by the current of their lusts beyond the barrier at many points, men do such deeds as wantonly outrage Nature, upset her order, and confuse her distinctions. For men have, in fact, attempted to consort with goats and sows and mares, and women have gone mad with lust for male beasts. From such unions your Minotaurs and Aegipans, and, I suppose, your Sphinxes and Centaurs have arisen. Yet it is through hunger that dogs have occasionally eaten a man; and birds have tasted of human flesh through necessity; but no beast has ever attempted a human body for lustful reasons. But the beasts I have mentioned and many others have been victims of the violent and lawless lusts of man.[402]

Gryllus's intention is to show how animals respect the natural order of the world and do not transgress the species' boundaries, contrary to men. Most of the examples of unnatural pairings of humans and animals that Gryllus mentions are mythological. He mentions the minotaur, son of Pasiphae and the bull, or Aegipans, usually identified as the god Pan; however, he starts by emphasising general examples of men who had sex with goats, sows and mares. Once again, we find a reference to goats, similar to what we have already seen in Herodotus, Theocritus and Meleager. We cannot, nevertheless,

[400] 987c-988e. Especially interesting are Gryllus' arguments on the equality of gender in animals, stating that both male and female are courageous, contrary to women who sit at home while men fight.
[401] 988f.
[402] Tr. Helmbold.

conclude that Gryllus is making a reference to real cases of human-animal sex. This text is an intellectual exercise of Plutarch, seeking to depict animals in a better light than humans. The specific sexual examples that he uses are clearly mythological, which is not surprising, considering the general context of the text. He specifically mentions Pasiphae instead of other mythological examples such as Europa and Leda. It is a reaffirmation of the transgressional character of the sexual act between animal and human that I have already discussed in detail. Gryllus mentions goats, pigs and mares as the animals most commonly ravished by men. All of them are animals that humans were used to taming, and so would be at their disposal. The constant reference to goats hints that the animal would be a common target for a man with a sexual appetite for animals, and especially of goatherds, since they would have privileged access to the animal. Therefore, I do think that Plutarch conveys at least a certain awareness that there were people who sexually enjoyed animals, a behaviour that he deems as unnatural.

Besides allusions to humans who display sexual desires towards animals (and also contrary to what is said by Gryllus), we also have references to animals who felt sexual desire for humans. Athenaeus (606b-c), in the second century C.E., provided examples of animals that fell in love (ἠράσθη) with humans:

Καὶ ἄλογα δὲ ζῷα ἀνθρώπων ἠράσθη. Σεκούνδου μέν τινος βασιλικοῦ οἰνοχόου ἀλεκτρυών· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ ὁ μὲν ἀλεκτρυὼν Κένταυρος, ὁ δὲ Σεκοῦνδος ἦν οἰκέτης Νικομήδους τοῦ Βιθυνῶν βασιλέως, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Νίκανδρος ἐν ἕκτῳ Περιπετειῶν. ἐν Αἰγίῳ δὲ παιδὸς ἠράσθη χήν, ὡς Κλέαρχος ἱστορεῖ ἐν πρώτῳ Ἐρωτικῶν· τὸν δὲ παῖδα τοῦτον Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ Ἐρωτικῷ Ἀμφίλοχον καλεῖσθαί φησι καὶ τὸ γένος Ὠλένιον εἶναι, Ἑρμείας δ᾽ ὁ τοῦ Ἑρμοδώρου, Σάμιος δὲ γένος, ἐρασθῆναι Λακύδους τοῦ φιλοσόφου. ἐν δὲ Λευκαδίᾳ φησὶν Κλέαρχος οὕτως ἐρασθῆναι ταὼν παρθένου ὡς καὶ τὸν βίον ἐκλιπούσῃ συναποθανεῖν. δελφῖνα δ᾽ ἐν Ἰασῷ παιδὸς ἐρασθῆναι λόγος, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Δοῦρις ἐν dτῇ ἐνάτῃ. ὁ δὲ λόγος ἐστὶν αὐτῷ περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ λέγει οὕτως· μετεπέμψατο δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῆς Ἰασοῦ παῖδα· περὶ γὰρ τὴν πόλιν ταύτην Διονύσιός τις ἦν παῖς, ὃς μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐκ παλαίστρας παραγινόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν θάλατταν ἐκολύμβα. δελφὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ πελάγους ἀπήντα καὶ ἀναλαμβάνων ἐπὶ τὰ νῶτα ἔφερεν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον νηχόμενος καὶ πάλιν ἀποκαθίστα εἰς τὴν γῆν.

Irrational animals have also fallen in love with human beings. A rooster, for example, (fell in love with) a royal wine-steward named Secundus. The rooster was named Centaurus, and Secundus was a household-slave of Nicomedes, the king of Bithynia, according to Nicander in Book VI of the Reversals of Fortune. In Aegeum a goose fell in love with a boy, according to Clearchus in Book I of the Erotica; Theophrastus in his Erotic Essay says that this boy was named Amphilochus and that his family was from Olene. Hermeias the son of Hermodorus, whose family was from Samos, on the other hand, (claims that the goose)

fell in love with the philosopher Lacydes. And in Leucadia, according to Clearchus, a peacock fell so deeply in love with a girl that when she passed away, it died at the same time. There is a story that a dolphin fell in love with a boy in Iasus, according to Duris in Book IX. His account involves Alexander, and goes as follows: (Alexander) also summoned the boy from Iasus. For there was a boy named Dionysius, who lived near this city, and who left the wrestling-school along with the other boys and was down by the sea swimming. A dolphin came up to him out of the sea; took him up on its back; swam around carrying him for a long time; and deposited him again on the shore.[403]

This passage follows other descriptions that Athenaeus makes of love and pleasure, such as the love for a wife, for boys and for statues. Although it is a text from the second century of our era, this passage carries several references that precede the author's time. There is a reference to the love of a rooster named Centaurus and a boy named Secundus. The boy was, according to Nicander, a slave of Nicomedes, who ruled the Hellenistic kingdom of Bithynia. It is not clear who Nicomedes is, since there were several Bithynian kings of that name, but it is most likely a reference to Nicomedes II (149-128 B.C.E.), since it is thought that Nicander lived in the second century B.C.E. Athenaeus makes a reference to Clearchus of Soli, a pupil of Aristotle, who wrote the *Erotica*. Athenaeus further mentions Theophrastus, the writer of the *Erōtikō Amphilochon*, who supposedly studied under Plato and then Aristotle. He also mentions the philosopher Lacydes of Cyrene, who was the head of the school in Athens after Arcesilaus in the third century B.C.E.; and Duris of Samos, who lived in the fourth-third century B.C.E. All of these men that Athenaeus refers to precede him by at least three to four hundred years, back to the Hellenistic period.

Although the references to love between animals and humans is clearly hyperbolised (as we can see from the example of the peacock who died of a broken heart), and no sexual intercourse is described, it is nonetheless a clear reference to an erotic connection between human and animal outside of the mythological spectrum. It is a reference that sexually inspired connections between men, women and beasts were recognised and were part of the *imaginarium* of Classical-Hellenistic times, to the point

[403] Tr. Olson.

that tales of human-animal love would be part of compendiums of erotic poems, like the ones of Clearchus and Theophrastus. However, the references are not clear on the reactions that such erotic connections might provoke. Athenaeus is only quoting examples and not providing his interpretation or his thoughts on the passages.

He proceeds to tell two stories of animals who fell in love with humans, both told by Phylarchus, the historian from the third century B.C.E. The first is another story involving dolphins,[404] and the second is a story of an elephant who loved a baby:

φιλανθρωπότατον δέ ἐστι καὶ συνετώτατον τὸ ζῷον ὁ δελφὶς χάριν τε ἀποδιδόναι ἐπιστάμενον. Φύλαρχος γοῦν ἐν τῇ δωδεκάτῃ, Κοίρανος, φησίν, ὁ Μιλήσιος ἰδὼν ἁλιέας τῷ δικτύῳ λαβόντας δελφῖνα καὶ μέλλοντας κατακόπτειν ἀργύριον δοὺς καὶ παραιτησάμενος ἀφῆκεν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ναυαγίᾳ χρησάμενος περὶ Μύκονον καὶ πάντων ἀπολομένων μόνος ὑπὸ δελφῖνος ἐσώθη ὁ Κοίρανος. τελευτήσαντος δ᾽ αὐτοῦ γηραιοῦ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι καὶ τῆς ἐκφορᾶς παρὰ τὴν θάλατταν γιγνομένης κατὰ τύχην, ἐν τῷ λιμένι πλῆθος δελφίνων ἐφάνη ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ μικρὸν ἀπωτέρω τῶν ἐκκομιζόντων τὸν Κοίρανον, ὡσεὶ συνεκφερόντων καὶ συγκηδευόντων τὸν ἄνθρωπον. ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἱστορεῖ Φύλαρχος διὰ τῆς εἰκοστῆς ὅσην ἐλέφας φιλοστοργίαν ἔσχεν εἰς παιδίον. γράφει δ᾽ οὕτως· τούτῳ δὲ τῷ ἐλέφαντι συνετρέφετο θήλεια ἐλέφας, ἣν Νίκαιαν ἐκάλουν· ᾗ τελευτῶσα ἡ τοῦ τρέφοντος Ἰνδοῦ γυνὴ παιδίον αὐτῆς τριακοσταῖον παρακατέθετο. ἀποθανούσης δὲ τῆς ἀνθρώπου δεινή τις φιλοστοργία γέγονε τοῦ θηρίου πρὸς τὸ παιδίον· οὔτε γὰρ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ χωριζόμενον τὸ βρέφος ὑπέμενεν, τὸ δὲ εἰ μὴ βλέποι τὸ παιδίον ἤσχαλλεν. ὅτ᾽ οὖν ἡ τροφὸς ἐμπλήσειεν αὐτὸ τοῦ γάλακτος, ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ποδῶν τοῦ θηρίου ἐτίθει αὐτὸ ἐν σκάφῃ· εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο πεποιήκοι, τροφὴν οὐκ ἐλάμβανεν ἡ ἐλέφας. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα δι᾽ ὅλης τῆς ἡμέρας τοὺς καλάμους λαμβάνων ἐκ τῶν παρατιθεμένων χορτασμάτων καθεύδοντος τοῦ βρέφους τὰς μυίας ἀπεσόβει· ὅτε δὲ κλαίοι, τῇ προβοσκίδι τὴν σκάφην ἐκίνει καὶ κατεκοίμιζεν αὐτό. τὸ δ᾽ αὐτὸ ἐποίει καὶ ὁ ἄρρην ἐλέφας πολλάκις. ὑμεῖς δέ, ὦ φιλόσοφοι, καὶ τῶν δελφίνων καὶ τῶν ἐλεφάντων ἐστὲ κατὰ τὴν γνώμην ἀγριώτεροι ἔτι τε ἀνημερώτεροι, καίτοι Περσαίου τοῦ Κιτιέως ἐν τοῖς Συμποτικοῖς Ὑπομνήμασιν bβοῶντος καὶ λέγοντος περὶ ἀφροδισίων ἁρμοστὸν εἶναι ἐν τῷ οἴνῳ μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι· καὶ γὰρ πρὸς ταῦτα ἡμᾶς ὅταν ὑποπίωμεν ἐπιρρεπεῖς εἶναι. καὶ ἐνταῦθα τοὺς μὲν ἡμέρως τε καὶ μετρίως αὐτοῖς χρωμένους ἐπαινεῖν δεῖ, τοὺς δὲ θηριωδῶς καὶ ἁπλήστως ψέγειν.

Dolphins are extremely friendly and intelligent creatures, and know how to return a favor. Phylarchus in Book XII, for example, says: When Coiranus of Miletus saw that some fishermen had caught a dolphin in their net and intended to butcher it, he gave them some money and, after they turned it over to him, released it back into the sea. Afterward, he was shipwrecked near Myconos, and although everyone else died, Coiranus alone was rescued by a dolphin. He died as an old man in his native country, and his funeral procession happened to proceed along the seashore; a school of dolphins appeared in the harbor that day, very close to the people accompanying Coiranus to his grave, as if the dolphins as well were part of the procession and were participating in his burial. In Book XX the same Phylarchus describes how devoted an elephant was to a baby. He writes as follows: A she-elephant known as Nicaea was kept along with this elephant, and when the wife of the Indian to whom the elephants belonged was dying, she entrusted her month-old baby to it. After the woman died, the beast became deeply devoted to the baby; it refused to be separated from the child, and if it could not see the baby, it became upset. So once the nurse had filled the child with milk, she would set it in a trough between the beast's feet; if she failed to do so, the elephant refused to eat. After that, all day long the elephant would take stalks from the fodder it was given and would shoo the flies away from the child as it slept. And whenever the child cried, the elephant rocked the trough

[404] Love between dolphins and dolphins was already registered by Aristotle (*Hist. an*.8.48.631a8-11). See also Konstan, 2013: 15-16.

with its trunk and tried to put it to sleep; and the male elephant often behaved the same way. But your minds, my philosophers, are more savage and untamed than those of dolphins or elephants, even though Persaeus of Citium in his *Drinking Party Commentaries* shouts and proclaims that it is appropriate to discuss sex while drinking wine; because when we have a bit to drink, we incline in that direction. This is also a fitting context in which to praise people who enjoy sex in a mild and moderate way, and to criticize those who behave like wild animals and cannot get enough of it.[405]

These two stories move away from the realm of sexual desire. They seem to be displays of a more perpetual feeling than sexual arousal. The story of the dolphin shows an animal reacting like a man should act, reciprocating the saving of its life by saving a life. It is a bond of friendship and respect, to the point that when Coiranus died the dolphins participated in his funeral honours. The elephant story humanises the animal, emphasising Nicaea's motherly instincts. Here, Athenaeus is no longer conveying stories of sexual desires between humans and animals, but rather the story of animals who behave like humans should.

However, despite the two final stories not carrying the same erotic meaning as the ones told before, Athenaeus seems to conclude his thoughts on this topic by returning to the erotic examples. He addresses the philosophers at the table, by emphasising that their minds are more savage than the minds of dolphins and elephants, therefore more like the minds of the animals on the former examples, such as the peacock or Secundus, or the rooster, who had no power to control their own desires. In the final line, Athenaeus provides the reader with his own thoughts on the matter: we should praise the people who enjoy sex in a moderate (μετρίως) way and criticise the ones who behave like wild beasts (θηριωδῶς). Behaving like a beast is wrong, and therefore sex between humans and beasts, which is beastlike behaviour, is fundamentally wrong.

This negative notion of sex between human and animals is further emphasized by Artemidorus. As I discussed in the introduction, at the end of the first book of the *Oneirocritica*, Artemidorus explores sex contrary to nature (παρά φύσιν συνουσίας), and under that category he lists dreams where a person is having sex with a wild beast (θηρίῳ

[405] Tr. Olson.

μιγῆναι). He is conveying a social view and not a specific personal bias against the sexual practice, as is noticeable throughout his work. By stating that sex with beasts is against nature and that it is against the natural sexual behaviour of humans, Artemidorus provides us with the general perception on human-animal sex, not only of the society of his time but most likely of the historical view on the practice.

3.6. Conclusion

In this chapter, I started by exploring the perception that ancient Greeks had of animals, and how they considered them, especially in relation to themselves. By exploring ancient conceptions of animals, I showed that they were generally considered a category of living beings less important than humans, and therefore we can establish that sexual involvement between the two would translate as sex with a lower type of creature. This assertion influences the social perception of sex with animals, as a negative, morally and naturally wrong practice, which becomes clear when we equate the rest of the material that was explored in this chapter. In the following sections, I have shown how human-animal sex was part of several Greek myths. Most of the myths where we find the sex with animals motif does not shed a light on human-animal sex, since they portray animal-shaped gods, and not animals *per se*. As was explained by Robson, these myths help to articulate the relation that humans have with the divine. The myth of Pasiphae, however, deviates from the general structure of this typology of myths, since the animal is not a god in disguise and also because a woman takes the initiative in copulating with the animal. The bestial sex results in a bestial outcome: the minotaur, the embodiment of the transgression. The lack of artistic representations of Pasiphae further emphasises the anxiety towards human-animal sex. When comparing it with the number of representations of Europa and the bull, it becomes clear that the problem is not the animal

element *per se*, but rather the fact that the animal that Pasiphae lusts after is not a metamorphosed god. The non-depiction of the transgression is intentional, and for it the protagonist, Pasiphae, is erased from the Greek artistic scene. The minotaur simultaneously signifies a transgression of the natural laws of human conception. Human pregnancy, which could only be achieved by divine or human intervention was, in this myth, also possible for animals. From all of the transgressions that I explore in this thesis, this is the sole example where there is conception, however it is a monstrous result. The birth of the minotaur is a warning to anyone, and especially any woman, who wants to have intercourse with an animal.

In the final section, I have shown how human-animal sex is addressed in other literary sources. Herodotus seems to be shocked by the Egyptian tradition of women offering themselves to a goat. The sexual appeal of goats is briefly explored in Theocritus' first *Idyll,* as well as in Meleager's epigram, and is even referred to by Plutarch, in the *Gryllus*. The constant reference to sex with goats seems to have been something of a commonplace in ancient Greek literature, most likely reflecting a real practice or at least rumours that were conveyed. Therefore, I not only believe that sex between humans and animals existed in ancient Greece, but that it was also, as in modern Western societies, negatively considered, a commonly recognized sexual transgression, a para-philia as I refer to it in this thesis. Almost every ancient source that makes a reference to human-animal sex hints at a negative perception of the practice. The myth of Pasiphae, a narrative where a woman and an actual animal, not an animal-shaped god, copulate, results in the birth of hybrid, unnatural creature. Artistic representations of actual sex acts with animals usually portray satyrs instead of humans, emphasising the transgressive nature of the action, since satyrs are transgressive creatures by nature. Theocritus hints at and Meleager mocks goatherds who sexually use goats. Plutarch's Gryllus criticises humans who have sex with animals, branding the action as a crime against nature (φύσις), a crime that animals never commit, since they do not willingly engage in inter-species sex. Athenaeus

praises men who behave in a moderate way and do not engage in bestial-like behaviour, such as sex with animals. All the references that we have to human-animal sex, either in myth, iconography or literature, hint that the action was not socially accepted, that was against the norm and even against nature.

CHAPTER 4

SEX WITH CORPSES

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter I explore sexual intercourse with corpses in ancient Greece, analysing the reasons why it was considered a transgressive behaviour. I start by providing a general view on how the ancient Greeks dealt with corpses. By exploring the correct behaviour towards a cadaver, I can more clearly show how sex with corpses is a behaviour that goes against the social convention on how to handle dead people. I then move to analyse specific examples, starting with the only possible reference to sex with corpses in myth – Achilles and Penthesilea. I then explore references found in Herodotus, particularly the tale of Periander and Melissa, Parthenius of Nicaea and Xenophon of Ephesus.

Sex with corpses is generally identified as necrophilia, today. That is the term used in the *DSM-V* (705), which lists necrophilia under the "other specified paraphilic disorder" category, alongside zoophilia, describing it as a recurrent and intense sexual arousal involving corpses. Similar to the description of the *DSM*, "sexual penetration of a corpse" and "intercourse with an animal" are also grouped under "other offences", in the *Sexual Offences Act* of 2003. It establishes a maximum of twelve months of imprisonment for a person who sexually uses a corpse. Similar to the examples explored in the previous chapters, the term has also been adopted by classics scholars. Although we do not have one reference work on sex with corpses in ancient Greece, most of the scholarly references to episodes where the behaviour is attested, especially when discussing the episode of Periander and Melissa, usually refer to this sexual behaviour as

necrophilia.[406] This is anachronistic. Like every other use of paraphiliac terms explored in the previous chapters, the term necrophilia is a modern concept and it is used in both psychiatric and legal definitions. When we look at the examples of sexual use of corpses in ancient Greece, we cannot state that the Greeks considered the behaviour as an example of mental problems, or punishable under law, therefore using the term in this context attributes modern characteristics to ancient culture.

However, this sexual behaviour shares similar traits with all the other examples explored in this thesis, and the information conveyed by the ancient sources on this practice shows that it was negatively considered. It is a para-philiac behaviour. To avoid falling into anachronisms, in this chapter I refer to the act of having sexual intercourse with the body of a dead person as 'sex with corpses'. This follows the phrasing that Artemidorus uses to refer to this transgression. As I have discussed in the introduction, Artemidorus classifies 'sex with a corpse', *nekrō migēnai*, as sex against nature (παρά φύσιν συνουσίας), implying that it would be considered a transgressive sexual behaviour. Sex with a corpse is against the proper handling of a body, transgressing the boundaries established by the funerary rites in ancient Greece, as I show in the following section.

4.2. Proper care of the corpse

Here I explore how the ancient Greeks conceived that a corpse should be cared for, the appropriate way to handle the body, and the correct way to dispose of it. By

[406] Gray (1986: 379), Gammie (1986: 194), Pellizer (1993: 810), Johnson (2001: 18), Moles (2007: 254), Younger (2011: 86) all use 'necrophilia' to refer to Periander's sexual intercourse with his wife's corpse. In a different example, Cueva (2018: 367), when describing the episode where the mummified wife of Aegialeus, Thelxinoe, is presented to Habrocomes, comments that there "just is no way to make pretty a case of necrophilia".

stressing the socially approved behaviour towards cadavers, I am able to better exemplify how sex with corpses transgressed these boundaries.

The typical Greek funeral is a good example of the rigorous care that one needs to have with the corpse. As Garland (1985: 21) noted, the Greek funeral was typically composed of three different acts: the laying of the body, *prothesis*, taking it to the final resting place, *ekphora*, and disposing of the inhumed or cremated remains. This system is already clear in Homer. The funeral of Patroclus is the most elaborate example of a funerary ritual in the Homeric poems. The body of the fallen warrior is first burnt, alongside various animals (including two of Patroclus' dogs), and twelve Trojan prisoners. His bones are afterwards picked up from the ashes, placed in an urn, and taken to his tumulus.[407] The ritual of washing the corpse is also present in the *Iliad*. Apollo washed the blood off Sarpedon's body in the river, anointed him with ambrosia, and clothed him, before being given to Hypnos and Thanatos. The washing of the body, alongside the closing of the deceased's eyes, were the first cares to be given to a corpse, rituals that were most likely performed by the women of the family.[408] Achilles (*Il*. 24.580-590) orders the slave girls to wash and dress the disfigured body of Hector, before handing it over to Priam. In the *Odyssey* (21.423-426), the ghost of Agamemnon tells Odysseus that his wife, Clytemnestra, did not close his eyes, like a wife was supposed to. In the *Phaedo* (115a), after drinking the poison, Socrates says that it was time to bathe, so he would save the women the inconvenience of washing his dead body. After the corpse was correctly bathed, clothed and covered with a shroud, it was laid on the bed and disposed with the feet facing towards the door.[409] A law attributed to Solon (Dem. 43.62-3) establishes that the body should be laid inside the house, and should been taken

[407] For more on the burial of Patroclus, see Petropoulou, 1988.
[408] Garland (1985: 24), states that if a person was expecting to die, they might have performed this ritual cleansing themselves. This is indeed what Alcestis did, when she knew that the hour of her death was upon her.
[409] Garland (1985: 24-25), provides artistic depictions where these rituals are represented.

to the burial place on the day after, before the sun rises.[410] The body would then be transported to the place where it would be cremated or buried.[411] In Homeric times, cremation seems to have been the common method of disposal of the body, although this practice seems to have been somewhat intercalated with burial in the Classic and Hellenistic periods.[412] Cemeteries are usually situated outside the city. The burial rituals are marked by the necessity to separate the remains from the world of the living - disposing of a body outside the city, in a new one, a necropolis.[413] The importance of funerary rites is of such a magnitude, that even when humans are not able to perform them, the gods intervene. The bodies of the sons and daughters of Niobe were not buried because the entire community had been turned to stone by Zeus. The corpses were laid on open ground, bathing in their own blood, for nine days until the gods themselves descended from Olympus and properly buried them.[414]

Perhaps no Greek tragedy focuses more on the relevance of a proper burial than Sophocles' *Antigone*. The key element of the plot is Creon's denial of Polynices' right to a proper burial that instigates Antigone's resistance and disobedience against the ruler of Thebes.[415] Creon defends his option by proclaiming his political power over the city, while Antigone rebuts his claims, stating that the right to a proper burial is divine. Already from the *prologos* we have her arguing that the lack of a proper burial is a dishonour (ἀτιμάσας) to her brother (22), and she clearly shows her disposition to bury him, even if she is eventually punished for it. For Antigone, not burying a family member is betraying her own blood, and if she dies for committing a "divine offence" (ὅσια πανουργήσασ᾽), she will die with honour. She more than once (29; 205-206) emphasizes that could not

[410] On this see Kurtz and Boardman (1971: 143-44); Garland (1985: 23-30); Johnston (1999: 40); Mirto (2012: 70). See also the volume on the laws of Solon edited by Leão and Rhodes (p.121).
[411] For the *ekphora*, the procession, see Garland (1985: 31-34) and Mirto (2012: 81-84).
[412] For disposal of the corpse in tragedy, see Mirto, 2012: 84-85.
[413] For an analysis of the possible changes in attitudes toward death from the archaic to the classical period, see Morris, 1989.
[414] This contact between the gods and death seems to be somewhat different in tragedy. For this see Mirto, 2012: 63.
[415] For the burial of Polynices, see Margon, 1972; Rothaus, 1990 and Burnett, 2014.

leave her brother's body to be devoured by dogs and birds. When Antigone is caught trying to bury Polynices, and brought forth to Creon, he asks her why she dared to transgress his law (449: καὶ δῆτ᾽ ἐτόλμας τούσδ᾽ ὑπερβαίνειν νόμους). Her reply is categorical (450-470):

οὐ γάρ τί μοι Ζεὺς ἦν ὁ κηρύξας τάδε,
οὐδ᾽ ἡ ξύνοικος τῶν κάτω θεῶν Δίκη
τοιούσδ᾽ ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ὥρισεν νόμους,
οὐδὲ σθένειν τοσοῦτον ᾠόμην τὰ σὰ
κηρύγματ᾽ ὥστ᾽ ἄγραπτα κἀσφαλῆ θεῶν
νόμιμα δύνασθαι θνητά γ᾽ ὄνθ᾽ ὑπερδραμεῖν.
οὐ γάρ τι νῦν γε κἀχθές, ἀλλ᾽ ἀεί ποτε
ζῇ ταῦτα, κοὐδεὶς οἶδεν ἐξ ὅτου ᾽φάνη.
τούτων ἐγὼ οὐκ ἔμελλον, ἀνδρὸς οὐδενὸς
φρόνημα δείσασ᾽, ἐν θεοῖσι τὴν δίκην
δώσειν· θανουμένη γὰρ ἐξῄδη, τί δ᾽ οὔ;
κεἰ μὴ σὺ προὐκήρυξας. εἰ δὲ τοῦ χρόνου
πρόσθεν θανοῦμαι, κέρδος αὔτ᾽ ἐγὼ λέγω.
ὅστις γὰρ ἐν πολλοῖσιν ὡς ἐγὼ κακοῖς
ζῇ, πῶς ὅδ᾽ οὐχὶ κατθανὼν κέρδος φέρει;
οὕτως ἔμοιγε τοῦδε τοῦ μόρου τυχεῖν
παρ᾽ οὐδὲν ἄλγος· ἀλλ᾽ ἄν, εἰ τὸν ἐξ ἐμῆς
μητρὸς θανόντ᾽ ἄθαπτον <ὄντ᾽> ἠνεσχόμην,
κείνοις ἂν ἤλγουν· τοῖσδε δ᾽ οὐκ ἀλγύνομαι.
σοὶ δ᾽ εἰ δοκῶ νῦν μῶρα δρῶσα τυγχάνειν,
σχεδόν τι μώρῳ μωρίαν ὀφλισκάνω.

Yes, for it was not Zeus who made this proclamation,
nor was it Justice who lives with the gods below
that established such laws among men,
nor did I think your proclamations strong enough
to have power to overrule, mortal as they were,
the unwritten and unfailing ordinances of the gods.
For these have life, not simply today and yesterday, but for ever,
and no one knows how long ago they were revealed.
For this I did not intend to pay the penalty among the gods
for fear of any man's pride. I knew that I would die, of course I knew,
even if you had made no proclamation.
But if I die before my time, I account that gain.
For does not whoever lives among many troubles,
as I do, gain by death?
So it is in no way painful for me to meet with this death;
if I had endured that the son of my own mother should die and remain unburied,
that would have given me pain, but this gives me none.
And if you think my actions foolish,
that amounts to a charge of folly by a fool![416]

[416] Tr. Lloyd-Jones.

Antigone builds a case for the divine right of being buried, how she preferred to disobey the law of man to obey the law of the gods.[417] This topic is further explored in Euripides' *Suppliants* (517-540), a play that parts from the same context as *Antigone*, the war for Thebes. In this tragedy, Theseus argues how the right to a proper burial is shared by every Greek, how it is a "Panhellenic custom" (Πανελλήνων νόμον), further emphasising that by not allowing the burial of the Argives' corpses, Creon is not harming Argos but rather all Greece, since without the promise of a proper burial, every man would be afraid to fight. The relevance that Theseus gives to this question reflects how seriously this topic was addressed in his hometown. In Athens, the importance of providing a proper burial was even perceived in law. According to Aeschines (1.13), if a boy was pimped by his father, he was released from having to support him in the later stage of his life; however, he still needed to provide him with a proper burial.[418]

Therefore, the right to a proper burial/cremation is something to which every Greek person is entitled, since the time of Homer. Notwithstanding that some of the rituals might be different from city to city, the sources show that there was a common necessity of washing and clothing the body before cremating or burying it. It was asserted in Greek culture that the right to a proper burial was a divine law, and defying it, like Creon did, results in a divine punishment. Creon's foolhardiness eventually cost him the life of his son and wife, and consequently his dynasty. If ancient Greek tradition asserted that there were several rituals that should be performed, all of them guided by the intention of purifying and respecting the corpse, then, we can presume from the start that sexually using a corpse would be against the accepted behaviour. The uncontrollable desire for a corpse is more of a bestial trait (like the dogs and birds who want to devour Polynices' corpse) than human.

[417] She later (519) states that it is a law of Hades (ὅμως ὅ γ᾽ Ἅιδης τοὺς νόμους τούτους ποθεῖ).
[418] See also Garland, 1985: 102.

In the following sections, I explore the few descriptions that we have of sex with corpses, and, by showing them in opposition of the social accepted behaviour towards corpses, I explain how this action transgressed the boundaries of the accepted contact between human and dead body, and therefore constituted a transgressive sexual behaviour.

4.3. Evidence

There is only one mythological reference that possibly conveys an episode of sex with a corpse, or at least of a passion developed for a dead person. Apollodorus (E.5) mentions that Achilles, after killing Penthesilea in battle, fell in love with her after she died (μετὰ θάνατον ἐρασθεὶς). This passage is in line with the information provided in the surviving fragments of the *Aethiopis*, in which Thersites mocks Achilles for falling in love (ἔρως) with Penthesilea. Although it is not a clear reference to sex in myth, it is nevertheless a reference to the sexual attractiveness that a dead woman could have. Pausanias (5.11.6), when describing the temple of Zeus at Olympia, describes how Penthesilea is represented, with her life leaving her body, held in Achilles' arms (τελευταῖα δὲ ἐν τῇ γραφῇ Πενθεσίλειά τε ἀφιεῖσα τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἀνέχων ἐστὶν αὐτήν). This description further reinforces the Homeric image of Achilles falling in love with Penthesilea after her death. The same motif is later adapted by Quintus of Smyrna, in his *Posthomerica* (1.660-674). The author describes how Achilles kills Penthesilea, by throwing a spear through both her and her horse. When he took her helmet and gazed at the beautiful face of the Amazon, Achilles immediately felt heavy-hearted for killing the woman that he would have liked to take as a wife. None of these descriptions is a clear indication of sex with a corpse, however it is an example of the possible erotic appeal of the corpse of a beautiful woman, and how someone could love a dead body.

This sexual relevance of a cadaver was observed by Herodotus. He conveys two references to sex with corpses. In the first (2.89) he refers a story in which an Egyptian embalmer was caught having sex with the corpse of a beautiful woman:

> Τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τῶν ἐπιφανέων ἀνδρῶν, ἐπεὰν τελευτήσωσι, οὐ παραυτίκα διδοῦσι ταριχεύειν, οὐδὲ ὅσαι ἂν ἔωσι εὐειδέες κάρτα καὶ λόγου πλεῦνος γυναῖκες· ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεὰν τριταῖαι ἢ τεταρταῖαι γένωνται, οὕτω παραδιδοῦσι τοῖσι ταριχεύουσι. τοῦτο δὲ ποιεῦσι οὕτω τοῦδε εἵνεκεν, ἵνα μή σφι οἱ ταριχευταὶ μίσγωνται τῇσι γυναιξί· λαμφθῆναι γὰρ τινὰ φασὶ μισγόμενον νεκρῷ προσφάτῳ γυναικός, κατειπεῖν δὲ τὸν ὁμότεχνον.
>
> Wives of notable men, and women of great beauty and reputation, are not at once given over to the embalmers, but only after they have been dead for three or four days; this is done, that the embalmers may not have carnal intercourse with them. For it is said that one was found having intercourse with a woman newly dead and was denounced by his fellow-workman.[419]

Herodotus starts by stating that the bodies of wives of important men, and specially the corpses of beautiful women, were only given to the embalmers three or four days after their death. The objective of this delay was to allow the corpse to start decomposing, losing its sexual appeal in the process, and therefore not tempting the embalmer to engage in sexual intercourse with the dead woman. Supposedly, one man had once succumbed to his desires for the corpse, was caught by his fellow workman and denounced. Herodotus does not convey anything else on this episode. He simply narrates what he is told, without providing any personal opinion or even the fate of embalmer.[420]

His second reference to sex with corpses is much more relevant:

> πέμψαντι γάρ οἱ ἐς Θεσπρωτοὺς ἐπ᾽ Ἀχέροντα ποταμὸν ἀγγέλους ἐπὶ τὸ νεκυομαντήιον παρακαταθήκης πέρι ξεινικῆς οὔτε σημανέειν ἔφη ἡ Μέλισσα ἐπιφανεῖσα οὔτε κατερέειν ἐν τῷ κέεται χώρῳ ἡ παρακαταθήκη· ῥιγοῦν τε γὰρ καὶ εἶναι γυμνή· τῶν γάρ οἱ συγκατέθαψε ἱματίων ὄφελος εἶναι οὐδὲν οὐ κατακαυθέντων· μαρτύριον δέ οἱ εἶναι ὡν ἀληθέα ταῦτα λέγει, ὅτι ἐπὶ ψυχρὸν τὸν ἰπνὸν Περίανδρος τοὺς ἄρτους ἐπέβαλε. ταῦτα δὲ ὡς ὀπίσω ἀπηγγέλθη τῷ Περιάνδρῳ, πιστὸν γάρ οἱ ἦν τὸ συμβόλαιον ὃς νεκρῷ ἐούσῃ Μελίσσῃ ἐμίγη, ἰθέως δὴ μετὰ τὴν ἀγγελίην κήρυγμα ἐποιήσατο ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον ἐξιέναι πάσας τὰς Κορινθίων γυναῖκας. αἳ μὲν δὴ ὡς ἐς ὀρτὴν ἤισαν κόσμῳ τῷ καλλίστῳ χρεώμεναι, ὃ δ᾽ ὑποστήσας τοὺς δορυφόρους ἀπέδυσε σφέας πάσας ὁμοίως, τάς τε ἐλευθέρας καὶ τὰς ἀμφιπόλους, συμφορήσας δὲ ἐς ὄρυγμα Μελίσσῃ ἐπευχόμενος κατέκαιε. ταῦτα δέ οἱ ποιήσαντι καὶ τὸ δεύτερον πέμψαντι ἔφρασε τὸ εἴδωλον τὸ Μελίσσης ἐς τὸν κατέθηκε χῶρον τοῦ ξείνου τὴν παρακαταθήκην.

[419] Tr. Godley. As Lloyd (2007: 302) noticed, the reference to three days cannot be regarded as accurate, considering that Herodotus often uses the number three "as a typical or symbolic number".
[420] To Lloyd (2007: 302) the "connection with sexual abuses of the kind described by Herodotus may be nothing more than Greek gossip-mongering". However, regardless of its historical plausibility, it is a clear reference to a notion of sexual desire for a corpse.

[…] For he had sent messengers to the Oracle of the Dead on the river Acheron in Thesprotia to enquire concerning a deposit that a friend had left; but the apparition of Melissa said that she would tell him nought, nor reveal where the deposit lay; for she was cold (she said) and naked; for the raiment Periander had buried with her had never been burnt, and availed her nothing; and let this (said she) be her witness that she spoke truth—that it was a cold oven wherein to Periander had cast his loaves. When this message was brought back to Periander (for he had had intercourse with the dead body of Melissa and knew her token for true), immediately after the message he made a proclamation that all the Corinthian women should come out into the temple of Here. So they came out as to a festival, wearing their fairest adornment; and Periander set his guards there and stripped them all alike, ladies and serving-women, and heaped all the garments in a pit, where he burnt them, making prayers to Melissa the while. When he had so done and sent a second message, the ghost of Melissa told him the place where the deposit of the friend had been laid.[421]

I have already discussed Periander, and especially his actions towards Melissa, in chapter one (section 5). In this passage, Herodotus conveys two transgressions that Periander committed against his wife. First, he failed to provide her with the proper funerary ritual, failing to burn her garment. Because the clothes were not burnt with the body, Melissa was doomed to be forever naked in the underworld. The second is a sexual transgression. Melissa reveals that her oven was already cold, a reference to her dead body, her vagina, her womb, when Periander threw his loaves (ὅτι ἐπὶ ψυχρὸν τὸν ἰπνὸν Περίανδρος τοὺς ἄρτους ἐπέβαλε), a reference to his penis, the sexual act, and the man's ejaculation.[422] This occurrence was used by Melissa's ghost as a proof of the validity of her word. By conveying a story that only Periander could be aware of, and that he certainly expected to keep secret, Melissa's ghost presents rock-solid evidence of her identity to her former husband.[423] As Gammie (1986: 194) notes, this tale is a variation of the topic of despotic rulers forcing women in Herodotus (like the episode of the wife of Candaules or Pisistratus and his wife).[424] Similar to the episode of Candaules' wife, the critical tone against Periander's transgressive actions is noticeable, and like

[421] Tr. Godley.
[422] As Hornblower (2013: 265) noted, the metaphor applied here is so clear that 'the messengers would need to be slow-witted not to grasp the meaning".
[423] The same point was made by Hornblower (2013: 265): "The point of the 'evidence' or 'trustworthy token' (μαρτύριον, πιστόν συμβόλαιον) was to convince Periandros of her identy, because he and only he knew the truth of the necrophilia allegation. But as soon as she spoke the 'token' to the messenger(s), he or they surely knew the *fact* of the allegation about necrophilia."
[424] For a comparison of these two episodes, see Gammie (1986: 186-187).

Candaules, Periander did in time suffer the consequences of his transgressive behaviour – losing his son, Lycophron, meaning the end of his dynasty.

Periander's story is one example among several descriptions of despotic rulers that Herodotus includes in his work. Several scholars have debated the question of Herodotus' objectivity when writing about them. Pearson (1954: 140), argued that Herodotus' take on tyrants was deeply shaped by the expectations of his audience and his personal experiences in territories controlled by despotic rulers. The author specifically mentions the anti-tyrant sentiment that existed in contemporary Athens, as well as the suffering of his family at the hands of a tyrant, and his personal experience in Samos, where Polycrates was still very well remembered. Waters (1971), on the other hand, argues that the notion that Herodotus was particularly interested in tyrants and that his fixed view on them influenced him to use their stories as conveyors of moral lessons, are wrong. Ferrill (1978), when debating Herodotus' use of the term *tyrannis* (τυραννίς), argues that there is no reason to assume that Herodotus uses the word with a neutral meaning, especially due to the constant objections to tyranny that we find in the *Histories*. Gammie (1986) concludes that, overall, Herodotus provides the reader with both the positive and negative aspects of tyrants, although he does intensively explore their defects.[425] Like Pearson, Gammie also considers that Herodotus' take on tyrants was deeply influenced by the contemporary social bias against tyranny. Lateiner (1989: 170), argues that although modern historians tend to highlight the advancement of Greek civilization under the rule of tyrants, Herodotus does not stress their contributions, and never aims to paint tyranny under a good light. Hart (1993: 50) states that Herodotus' portrayal of tyranny is not consistently presented. In my opinion, Gammie makes a good point. A careful reading of the *Histories* will show that Herodotus does provide the reader

[425] As Gammie (1986: 195) states: "To a remarkable degree the historian draws upon the specific defects of the despotic ruler listed in the speech of Otanes (3.82.2): pride, impiety, human envy, incongruous behavior, violation of traditional laws and customs, violation of women, and wanton killing".

with good and bad aspects of kings, tyrants and despotic rulers in general. Nevertheless, there is a noticeable emphasis on their transgressions and the use of violence against women, which might be partially influenced by Herodotus' personal experience of living under tyrannical rule.

The tale of Melissa's death is narrated by Socles (5.92), the longest speech in Herodotus,[426] as part of the Lacedaemonians' deliberation concerning the support of Hippias' return to Athens.[427] The introduction of this long speech shows a clear anti-tyranny spirit: the Lacedaemonian plan is terrible, because it is destroying the equality of rights (ἰσοκρατία) among the people and paving the way to a return to tyrannical rule in the cities of Greece. Socles further argues that there is nothing more unjust or bloodthirsty among men than tyranny (τοῦ οὔτε ἀδικώτερον ἐστὶ οὐδὲν κατ᾽ ἀνθρώπους οὔτε μιαιφονώτερον). This beginning supposedly sets the anti-tyrannical theme of the speech, however, as the narrative progresses, and the Corinthian logos is gradually included, the negative emphasis on tyranny is somewhat nuanced. Much has been written about this speech and what Herodotus intended to convey. Forrest (1966: 110) argues that much of Herodotus' account is "fairy-tale, much of the rest is distorted by its context (it is told as part of a general argument against tyranny of which Cypselus is held up, not very successfully, as a black example)". When discussing Herodotus' narrative on Periander, Waters (1971: 18-20) argues that Herodotus is not unsympathetic towards the tyrant, referring to the sexual encounter with Melissa's corpse as a "tale told for its own sake", further arguing that later historians found much more material to taint Periander.[428]

[426] On Socles' speech, see Gray, 1996. See Hornlower (2013: 246) for the historical value of Socles and his speech.

[427] There are no other ancient references to Periander's sexual transgression. Athenaeus (13.589f), says that, according to Pythaenetus' *History of Aegina*, Periander was filled with an immense sexual desire (ἔραμαι) after seeing Melissa dressed in the Peloponnesian manner (no cloak, only a tunic), while serving wine. Diogenes Laertius (1.70), tells that Melissa's real name was Lysida, and that Periander killed her by hitting her with a footstool (or a kick), when she was pregnant. Supposedly, he had been egged on by tales conveyed by concubines and, according to Diogenes, he burned them alive afterwards. The lust of Periander and how he killed Melissa are conveyed in later authors, but none of them revisits the sexual episode, possibly not wanting to discuss the sexual transgression.

[428] Waters further adds that Herodotus returns to Periander (5.95) to discuss his role as international arbiter between Athens and Mytilene, using this as an argument for Herodotus' objectivity.

Lateiner (1989: 170-71), on the other hand, argues that Herodotus shows the Corinthian tyrants, Cypselus and Periander, under a "sinister light", emphasising "banishments, confiscations, vicious mutilations, executions, and sexual outrage". Hart (1993: 52) argues that every part of the Periander story, apart from the arbitration episode and the war with Epidaurus, is a "'logos', a popular tale of the type that tends to attach itself to powerful personalities of the moderately recent past and cannot be taken as evidence of Herodotus' political views". Johnson (2001: 1) points out that, although Socles might indeed be a historical person, his speech completely fails to fulfil its initial aim: to show how terrible tyranny is.[429] Osborne (2002: 516) states that Herodotus has little interest in Corinth, and just offers some examples of the city's tyrannical rulers to help sustain his "particular presentation of autocracy". Moles (2007), starts his paper by providing a general view of the scholarship on this subject, and later (248) adds that Socles' speech does not provide an actual analysis of tyranny, and that its content has "strong *muthos* qualities", extending its narrative far into the past, relying on evidence that was orally transmitted, with a clear storytelling style that holds entertainment value.

Almost none of the scholars who addressed this speech provide any insight into the sexual act between Periander and Melissa's corpse. Hartog (1988: 332) is one of the few who rationalizes the inclusion of the sexual transgression in the narrative, arguing that, because Periander killed and had sex with her dead body, he represents transgression by excess, among the archaic tyrants. Pellizer (1993: 810) highlights the sex with Melissa's corpse as a reference meant to soil Periander's character, although emphasising that the worst act committed by the tyrant was the forced nakedness of the Corinthian women. Johnson (2011: 18) argues that the inclusion of the sexual transgression, alongside the burial of the naked body and his decision to strip all the women of Corinth, serves to bring the mistreatment of Melissa into public eyes, showing that Periander has

[429] In his words (p.3) "How, to name only the most glaring point, does telling of the amazing escape of the smiling babe Cypselus show the evil of tyranny?"

the power to treat every woman of Corinth as he treated his own wife. Johnson makes a good point. The episode of Periander's sexual intercourse with Melissa's corpse is in line with the part of Socles' discourse that aims to paint Periander under a sinister light. Moles (2007:253), notes that the sexual act is meant to be an example of the tyrant's character: a man that pursues his personal interests, instead of the interests of the people. This is in fact what we can affirm, concerning the aim of Socles' speech. The reference to sex with a corpse would serve to shock the audience, to further emphasise Periander's transgressive spirit. It is not possible to discern if this was Herodotus trying to undermine tyranny,[430] taking creative liberties and inventing a story for that effect; simply conveying a story that he heard and that was told about Periander; or, although more unlikely, an actual account of Socles' words. What is possible to discern is that the sexual use of the wife's corpse is grouped alongside other acts of extreme violence – the killing of one's wife and the mistreatment of the Corinthian women – and is one of the arguments – alongside the badly performed burial ritual – that Melissa's ghost uses to shame Periander. Like the transgressive sex that Pisistratus had with Megacles' daughter, Periander's sexual intercourse with the corpse of his wife would never lead to reproduction. Although the two transgressions are different, they are similar in this particular aspect and are both used by the same author to refer to two tyrants.

Another tale of sex with corpses is provided in Parthenius of Nicaea's *Sufferings in Love*, when he conveys the story of Thymoetes (31.2):

ἔνθα δὴ τὸν Θυμοίτην μετ᾽ οὐ πολὺν χρόνον ἐπιτυχεῖν γυναικὶ μάλα καλῇ τὴν ὄψιν ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων ἐκβεβλημένῃ, καὶ αὐτῆς εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν ἐλθόντα συνεῖναι. ὡς δὲ ἤδη ἐνεδίδου τὸ σῶμα διὰ μῆκος χρόνου, χῶσαι αὐτῇ μέγαν τάφον καὶ οὐδ᾽ ὡς4 ἀνιέμενον τοῦ πάθους ἐπικατασφάξαι αὐτόν.

Not long afterwards, Thymoetes encountered a very beautiful woman who had been cast ashore by the waves, fell in love, and had intercourse with her. But when the body at last began to decompose, owing to

[430] As Osborne (2002: 544) notes, the mistreatments of Melissa and the Corinthian women are the main examples of the injustice of tyranny, provided by Socles. Considering the anti-tyranny emphasis of the beginning of the speech, it would be expected that as the speech progresses more examples of tyrannical excesses would be provided.

the length of time it had been exposed, he heaped up a great mound for the woman; and when his passion did not abate even thus, he slew himself over the tomb.[431]

Supposedly, this story had already been told by Phylarchus (Ἱστορεῖ Φύλαρχος), the third century B.C.E. historian of whom no work has survived. We do not know anything else about the protagonist. The story follows the tale of Thymoetes' marriage to Euopis (31.1), the daughter of Troezen. In time, Thymoetes discovered that his wife was sexually involved with her brother, and revealed this situation to their father, Troezen. Ashamed, Euopis hanged herself, after cursing Thymoetes. It was after his wife's suicide that he discovered the corpse of a beautiful woman, which seems to be the result of Euopis' wishes. Thymoetes cannot resist the charm of the deceased woman, and does engage in sexual intercourse with her, probably more than once. Only when the body started to decompose (which suggests that the protagonist had time to enjoy it multiple times), did he bury her. However, not being able to placate the passion that he felt, he kills himself on top of the former corpse that he loved. We cannot consider this as an historical fact, despite the reference to Phylarchus, whose style and historiographical method is attacked by Polybius (2.56) and Plutarch (*Vit. Arat.* 38). The tale is conveyed like a mythological account, where the previous actions of a protagonist (notwithstanding whether he was right in doing them) will play a role in his untimely demise. By intruding in his wife's romance with her brother, which was by itself a sexual transgressional behaviour, Thymoetes is the one mainly responsible for her suicide. Consequently, Thymoetes would feel a similar transgressive passion. His love for the corpse is connected to Euopis' love for her brother, since they are both wrong. The two passions transgress the socially accepted boundaries for correct sexual behaviour, and therefore both transgressors met the same untimely death.

[431] Tr. Lightfoot.

An episode of sex with a corpse is portrayed in Xenophon of Ephesus' second century C.E. novel, the *Story of Anthia and Habrocomes*. At the beginning of book five, Habrocomes, in his search for Anthia, left Egypt and arrived in Syracuse, where he befriended Aegialeus, a fisherman originally from Laconia. Aegialeus proceeds to tell him his story, how he fell in love with Thelxinoe, a Spartan girl, and how they fled together so she would not be forced to marry another man. Aegialeus then informs Habrocomes that Thelxinoe had passed away recently, however he did not bury her. Instead, he mummified her, and forever kept her in their bed (5.9-11):

"καὶ τέθνηκεν ἐνταῦθα οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ Θελξινόη καὶ τὸ σῶμα οὐ τέθαπται, ἀλλὰ ἔχω γὰρ μετ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ ἀεὶ φιλῶ καὶ σύνειμι." καὶ ἅμα λέγων εἰσάγει τὸν Ἀβροκόμην εἰς τὸ ἐνδότερον δωμάτιον καὶ δεικνύει τὴν Θελξινόην γυναῖκα πρεσβῦτιν μὲν ἤδη, καλὴν <δὲ> φαινομένην ἔτι Αἰγιαλεῖ κόρην· τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτῆς ἐτέθαπτο ταφῇ Αἰγυπτίᾳ· ἦν γὰρ καὶ τούτων ἔμπειρος ὁ γέρων. "ταύτῃ οὖν" ἔφη, "ὦ τέκνον Ἀβροκόμη, ἀεί τε ὡς ζώσῃ λαλῶ καὶ συγκατάκειμαι καὶ συνευωχοῦμαι κἂν ἔλθω ποτὲ ἐκ τῆς ἁλιείας κεκμηκὼς αὕτη με παραμυθεῖται βλεπομένη· οὐ γὰρ οἵα νῦν ὁρᾶται σοὶ τοιαύτη φαίνεται ἐμοί· ἀλλὰ ἐννοῶ, τέκνον, οἵα μὲν ἦν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι, οἵα δὲ ἐν τῇ φυγῇ· τὰς παννυχίδας ἐννοῶ, τὰς συνθήκας ἐννοῶ."

"Thelxinoe died here not long ago and her body is not buried: I keep her with me and am always kissing her and being with her." As he was speaking he took Habrocomes into the innermost bedroom and showed him Thelxinoe, now an old woman but in Aegialeus' eyes still a young girl. Her body was embalmed by the Egyptian method, for the old man was also experienced in this. "And so, Habrocomes my boy," he said, "this way I can always talk to her as if she were alive, and lay with her and dine with her, and whenever I come home tired from fishing, the sight of her comforts me, for the way you see her now is not the way I see her. My boy, I think of her as she was in Laconia, as she was when we eloped; I think of our festival, I think of our covenant."[432]

Aegialeus states how he refused to bury her according to the Greek funerary rites, instead mummifying her in the Egyptian way (τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτῆς ἐτέθαπτο ταφῇ Αἰγυπτίᾳ), so he could keep her forever in his bed, where he could kiss and have intercourse with her (καὶ ἀεὶ φιλῶ καὶ σύνειμι). He shows no remorse, whatsoever, in proceeding as he did, but rather finds great personal solace in continuing to enjoy the married life, even after the death of his wife. Habrocomes also does not show any sort of disgust, but rather envies Aegialeus, asking himself if he will ever find Anthia, even as a corpse (νεκρός).

[432] Tr. Henderson.

There is a connection between this text and the first Herodotus passage that I have analysed. Aegialeus mummified his wife, like the Egyptians do, so he could keep enjoying her body, just as the Egyptian embalmers were reported to enjoy the corpses of beautiful women. Despite the odd encounter, Habrocomes is not shown to be shocked or horrified by the mummified wife. Cueva (2018: 367) comments that Habrocomes does not act as one would expect, that he never shows any fear and consequently "the audience parallels this lack of fear and expresses puzzlement".[433] In his paper, Cueva aimed to apply modern horror theory to the ancient Greek novel, concluding that despite the fact that the Habrocomes, Aegialeus and Thelxinoe episode does not instigate horror in the reader, other episodes such as the human sacrifice in Achilles Tatius do.

Habrocomes' reaction, as Cueva noted, indeed does not fit the expected behaviour that one would expect, in ancient Greece, when facing a clear description of a romantic/sexual involvement with a corpse. It does, however, fit the narrative of the novel. The Ephesian tale is a story of star-crossed lovers, and the unparalleled difficulties that two lovers had to face to be together. The episode of Aegialeus and Thelxinoe is included to reemphasise the value of true love, and the lengths to which someone will go to perpetuate that feeling. The episode is at the start of the fifth and final book. At this point, Habrocomes had been apart from Anthia since the beginning of the second book, and had attempted to find her through Egypt, Syria, Phoenicia, arriving at Syracuse at that point, on his way to Italy. By being faced with a story of perpetual love, like the one of Aegialeus, he is given something to aspire to. This is exemplified by his lament, where he questions if he will ever find Anthia, even as a corpse (πότε ἀνευρήσω κἂν νεκράν). He expresses his hope at least to find the same pleasure that Aegialeus finds in Thelxinoe's corpse. Therefore, the erotic relationship with a corpse, in this novel, is not an expression of transgressional sexual behaviour, but rather a metaphor for eternal love.

[433] I wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Edmund P. Cueva, for granting me access to his paper.

4.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, I started by exploring the proper way to handle a corpse, according to ancient Greek culture. By exploring the appropriate behaviour towards a cadaver, it becomes easier to understand how sex with a corpse transgresses the boundaries of physical contact between a living person and a dead one. In the following sections, I have explored every reference to sex with corpses that I could find in ancient Greek sources. The one that has been most explored by classical scholarship is the reference to the episode of Periander and Melissa. Although Herodotus' aims when portraying tyrannical figures are not always perceptible, I can affirm that the reference to Periander's sexual transgression did stain his image. It is not possible to discern whether Herodotus was simply conveying ancient gossip that he heard or taking creative liberties with the material that he had at his disposal, but we can nevertheless affirm that this episode was not meant to paint Periander in a positive light. It becomes even clearer when we look at the overall tone of that particular description. Herodotus writes about Periander's lust for gold, how he failed to perform the proper funerary ritual for his wife, how he sexually used her corpse, and how later, to satisfy Melissa's ghost so it would tell him the location of the treasure, he forced the women of Corinth to public nudity. In this example, the para-philia is one of the various transgressions that Periander committed. The problematics of a woman displaying her naked body to an audience, making visible what is not supposed to be seen, were already discussed in the first chapter.

The story of Thymoetes in Parthenius of Nicaea's *Sufferings in Love* also reinforces the transgressive nature of sexual contact with corpses. This is noticeable by the fact that the passion developed by Thymoetes for the woman's corpse is what eventually leads to his death, but also, if we consider the full context of the story, Thymoetes' transgressive behaviour mirrors his wife's own transgressions. When revealing that Euopis was sexually involved with her brother to their father, Troezen,

Thymoetes sealed their fate. Euopis' transgressive passion eventually led to her untimely death. Likewise, Thymoetes' transgressive passion led him to his untimely death. Sex between close relatives and sex with corpses are directly correlated in this text, and as shown in the introduction, both sexual behaviours were considered by different ancient authors as sex against nature, or *paranomoi* sexual activities.

Xenophon's novel is the only source that shows sex with corpses under a different light, however, in my opinion, it does not reflect, in any way, a social change towards the practice. The author uses Thelxinoe as a metaphor for eternal love, not focusing particularly on Aegialeus' sexual appetite for his wife's mummified body, but rather on how much he misses every aspect of married life. Within the wider context of the novel, it works as evidence for Habrocomes that eternal love is possible, renewing his hopes of finding Anthia, even if only as a corpse.

Therefore, I can conclude that ancient Greek sources show that sex with corpses was considered an unnatural behaviour, which transgressed the boundaries of accepted sexual intercourse, could be used as a literary motif to paint someone in a sinister light and, at least in the case of Thymoetes, could be a major contributing factor to someone's untimely death.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has provided new insights into the concept of sexual transgressions in ancient Greece, a topic that, until now, has been underexplored by classical scholarship. I have shown that several ancient authors considered different sexual behaviours to be transgressive, among them the four activities that I explored in detail. I showed how the ancient authors referred to these behaviours as against nature or against social norms, and the several transgressive aspects that they share, such as, for example, all being sexual acts that do not lead to reproduction, apart from one example. As explained before, this does not mean that the lack of reproductive capacity is a characteristic of all sexual activities deemed transgressive by the ancient Greeks. Different authors make references to different acts that are considered transgressive. However, the four activities that I analysed in this thesis do share the incapacity to achieve reproduction, except in the myth of Pasipahe. By providing a sociological approach to each specific sexual activity, I shed fresh light on sexual dynamics in ancient Greece, and how the sexual mores of one society are mutable and constantly adaptable concerning the position of power, social status and even the divine quality of the intervenients. I showed how the conception of transgressive sexual behaviour would change depending on whether it was directed towards a god, queen, average citizen, children of citizens, prostitute or slave. Therefore, like the rationale behind the formulation of the *DSM*, I can conclude that para-philias in ancient Greece were defined in opposition to the social construction of the concept of rightful sexual behaviour.

The Greek vocabulary to refer to these activities is, by itself, demonstrative of their transgressive, abnormal nature. These terms – *anomos, paranomos, kata physin, mē physei, para physin* – emphasise the unnatural and unsocial aspects of the sexual activities in question, how they do not conform to natural order and social norms, even, in some

specific cases, transgressing legal and religious boundaries. These two general aspects - transgression of natural order and social norms - are transversal to all the sexual activities that I explored in this thesis. For example, in chapter 1 I showed how the ancient Greek conception of a sexual transgression through vision could infringe not only social but also religious norms. Tiresias and Actaeon did not respect the sacral aspect of the *parthenoi* goddesses' bodies, gazing on what was not meant for mortal men to gaze on, and for this they were harshly punished. Pentheus spied the secret sacred rituals of Dionysus – partially motivated by sexual curiosity – and was dismembered. They transgressed religious boundaries through an action that also transgressed sexual, social limits. Gyges, although following Candaules' orders, did not respect the social boundaries that separate both a queen from a servant, and a man from another man's wife, and would be sentenced to death, not unlike Actaeon, unless he murdered his king. Humans do not share the same rights as gods, and this was further emphasised by the examples explored in chapter 3. Leda and Europa are not punished for having intercourse with an animal-shaped Zeus. On the other hand, Pasiphae's liaison with an actual bull consequently leads to bestial progeny, and to Pasiphae's disappearance from both mythological and artistic tradition. The difference lies in a notion of the natural order of the world. Leda and Europa's actions are in conformity with Zeus' will, respecting the divine prominence over the human. In other words, it was god's will, and neither women were punished for respecting it. Pasiphae, on the other hand, engaged in intercourse with an animal – not a god - a sub-human creature, trespassing natural boundaries, and is punished with an unnatural son and permanent reputation as an unchaste woman. These myths display different levels of transgression that reinforce the Greek notion of the natural order of the world. This is also perceptible in the examples explored in chapter 4. The story of Periander and Melissa shares some of the aspects of the story of Gyges and Candaules, mainly how tyrannical power might lead to the transgression of natural and social boundaries. Candaules, by making his wife visually available to another man, breaks the social barrier established

by marriage, in which one woman belongs to one man. Periander's sexual use of his wife's corpse is a transgression of the natural contact between living and dead humans, being one of various transgressional episodes that Herodotus uses to describe Periander's character. The story of Thymoetes and the corpse of the beautiful woman reinforces the transgressional aspect of sexual intercourse with a corpse, eventually leading Thymoetes to his demise. These actions share one major aspect, the incapacity of achieving reproduction. Both Periander and Thymoetes engage in a specific sexual activity that could never produce children. The four transgressional acts explored in this thesis never lead to legitimate reproduction. When they do, as in the myth of Pasiphae, the result is a monstrous being.

The sexual abuse of children shares similar transgressional aspects – a non-reproductive sexual action that goes against social norms - but in this case, unlike the other three, the sources hint at possible legal consequences. There was a distinction between boys that were ready to be courted and the ones that were not yet mature enough. The majority of the sources explored in this chapter point to this distinction between a boy that is mature and one that is not, which sets the social boundary for the sexual practice. We do not know of any case of child sexual abuse brought to court, however, we have enough information to assume that sexually abusing the son of a citizen, a future citizen himself, or a daughter, whose virginity would be a crucial aspect for a great marital match and the production of legitimate children, could motivate violent retribution. Violating a child would maculate the *oikos*, and by extension threaten the foundations of society. The situation would be different in case of sexual abuse by close relatives. As I have noted in chapter 2, children do not have an audible voice and it would be extremely difficult for an accusation against their father, for example, to come to light, therefore the child would not benefit from any legal protection from a close relative abuser.

Therefore, the rationale behind the formulation of the ancient Greek concept of sexual transgression is indeed similar to the conceptualization of the paraphilias category

in the *DSM*, namely social perception of what is right and what is not. However, I should once again reemphasize that paraphilias and para-philias, as I define them in this thesis, are not the same. One of the achievements of this thesis is to highlight the anachronisms that so easily arise from the intention to approach the ancient world through a transdisciplinary perspective and provide a new methodology to avoid it. There was no voyeurism or zoophilia in ancient Greece, unless by applying these terms we mean something different than their modern psychological/legal definition. However, the motivation behind deeming a specific sexual behaviour as transgressive finds a similar root for both paraphilias and para-philias – the sexual behaviour adopted by the majority of the population is 'normal', and the sexual behaviour which falls outside these boundaries is 'abnormal'. Like the sexual activities listed in the *DSM*, a common trait that these four transgressive sexual behaviours share is the fact that they do not lead to reproduction. Neither voyeurism nor sexual visual transgression, neither paedophilia nor child sexual abuse, neither zoophilia nor human-animal sex (with the exception of Pasiphae), neither necrophilia nor sex with corpses.

These sexual boundaries, like every other aspect of ancient Greek society, and contrary to modern psychological definitions of paraphilias, varied according to power and social status, an aspect that all the sexual behaviours explored in this thesis share. The behaviour expected of a male citizen towards a woman of free status was different from the behaviour of the same man towards a prostitute. Actaeon was punished because he saw the naked body of Artemis, but Artemis would not be punished if she saw the naked body of Actaeon. By gazing on the naked body of the goddess, he not only violated the normal social behaviour that regulated the contact between male and female other than his wife; but disrespected divine *nomos*, transgressing the religious boundaries that separate humans from gods. As I said in the introduction, if Gyges had gazed upon the naked body of a woman of low social status, instead of the queen, Herodotus would most likely never have conveyed the story. Like Actaeon, Gyges is not only transgressing the

general social behaviour that regulated the contact between men and women but is also gazing the body of a female figure of higher social status. It is particularly transgressive because it is the queen, the most important woman of a particular society. Therefore, the difference in social status plays a key role in determining the transgressiveness of a particular action. Candaules is punished because he made his wife, the queen, available to another man. He is not only nullifying the bond that husband and wife share, but he is also 'offering' the most important woman of the kingdom. If instead of the queen, Candaules had been obsessed with one of his slaves, and made that slave's body available to Gyges, there would have been no social or sexual transgression. If a man sexually used his prepubescent slave, it is unlikely that he would suffer any consequences. The slave would be his property, therefore the master would be within his right to use him sexually. If instead he sexually used the prepubescent slave of another citizen, a matter of damage to another's property could be raised, but there would not be any serious, violent consequence. On the other hand, if a citizen engaged in sexual intercourse with the prepubescent daughter or son of another citizen, there would most likely be legal or violent consequences. The status of the slave, the lowest social status of ancient Greek society, generally nullifies the transgressiveness of a sexual action. In other words, there is no transgression when a free man gazes upon the naked body or sexually uses a prepubescent slave, since the slave has no real social power.

The relevance of social status when analysing the full scope of para-philias in ancient Greece is further clarified by the examples explored in chapter 3 and 4. Europa is allowed to have sex with a bull-shaped Zeus, but Pasiphae's lust for an actual bull, notwithstanding that it was divinely induced lust, transgressed natural boundaries. Europa is not an example of transgressive behaviour. On the contrary, by engaging in intercourse with Zeus she fulfils the god's will, which is the correct, socially expected behaviour for humans. Pasiphae, on the other hand, did not engage in sexual intercourse with an animal-shaped god, instead fulfilling lustful purposes that are not in line with the socially

sanctioned human behaviour. In fact, Pasiphae does exactly the contrary of what Europa does: having sex with an animal, a sub-human creature, contrary to having sex with a god, who rules over humans. Once again, religion, social status and natural order play a crucial role in the definition of a transgressive sexual act. This social dynamic is also perceptible in Herodotus' description of the ancient Egyptian precautions when embalming the corpses of the wives of high-status men. These women belonged to a small social elite, holding a higher social status than most people of their society, and certainly higher than the men in charge of embalming them. On the other hand, Herodotus does not disclose whether a similar care was extended to the corpses of women of lower social status. Like the episode of Gyges and the queen, the transgression is particularly emphasised because of the social status of the 'victims'.

Therefore, the four sexual activities explored in this thesis are not only examples of sexual behaviours that the ancient Greeks referred to as transgressive, against nature and social norms, but also shared a social flexibility characteristic, in which the perspective of each para-philia would vary according to the social status of the persons involved. Power, social status, religion, social boundaries, culture and biology were key factors in the determination of the sexual dynamics of ancient Greek societies. Sex is subjected to the same boundaries – natural, social, religious - that rule over every aspect of ancient Greek culture and consequently establishes what is natural and normal, in opposition to unnatural and abnormal. As Winkler (1990a: 171) states, "If sex were simply a natural fact, we could never write its history. And then one of our favorite modern projects – to describe the development and periodization and dialectical interaction of the sex/ gender systems of the varied societies we know – would have to be abandoned". Winkler's point is that we cannot write about sex without understanding the entire context of a particular society. To understand para-philias in ancient Greece, we need to understand the social, cultural, religious, legal context of the society in question. There is no study of sex in ancient Greece, without considering and understanding every

aspect of ancient Greek society and culture. This is exactly what I have shown in this study of para-philias in ancient Greece.

Bibliography

Ancient Texts

Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Translated by Gaselee, S. (1969) (LCL 45) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Aeschines, *Against Timarchos*. Translated by Fisher, N. (2001) (Clarendon Ancient History Series) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____, *Against Timarchos.* Translated by Carey, C. (2001) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 3). Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 18-87.

_____, *On the Embassy*. Translated by Carey, C. (2001) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 3). Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 88-158.

Aeschylus, *Suppliants*. Translated by Sommerstein, A. H. (2009) (LCL 145) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 277-431.

_____, *Prometheus Bound*. Translated by Sommerstein, A. H. (2009) (LCL 145) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 432-563.

_____, *Agamemnon*. Translated by Sommerstein, A. H. (2009) (LCL 146) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2-207.

_____, *Libation-Bearers*. Translated by Sommerstein, A. H. (2009) (LCL 146) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 208-353.

Anacreon, [fragments]. Translated by Campbell, D. A. (1988) (LCL 143) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*. Translated by Hanson, J. A. (1996) (LCL 44, 454) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Aristophanes, *Acharnians*. Translated by Henderson, J. (1998) (LCL 178) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 48-219.

_____, *Clouds*. Translated by Henderson, J. (1998) (LCL 488) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 3-214.

_____, *Peace*. Translated by Henderson, J. (1998) (LCL 488) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 419-602.

_____, *Birds*. Translated by Henderson, J. (2000) (LCL 179) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 2-253.

_____, *Lysistrata*. Translated by Henderson, J. (2000) (LCL 179) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 254-443.

_____, *Thesmophoriazusae*. Translated by Sommerstein, A. H. (1994) Warminster, Wiltshire: Aris & Phillips.

_____, *Women at the Thesmophoria*. Translated by Henderson, J. (2000) (LCL 179). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 444-615.

_____, *Thesmophoriazusae*. Translated by Austin, C., Olson, S. D. (2004) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____, *Thesmophoriazusae*. Translated by Cottone, R. S. (2016) Paris: Éditions de Boccard.

_____, *Frogs*. Translated by Henderson, J. (2002) (LCL 180) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 3-237.

_____, *Assemblywomen*. Translated by Henderson, J. (2002) (LCL 180) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 238-414.

Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*. Translated by Freese, J. H. (1926) (LCL 193) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____, *Athenian Constitution*. Translated by Rackham, H. (1935) (LCL 285) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 2-189.

_____, *Nicomachean Ethics.* Translated by Rackham, H. (1934) (LCL 73) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____, *Nicomachean Ethics.* Translated by Irwin, T. (1999) Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett Pub. Co.

_____, *Nicomachean ethics*. Translated by Crisp, R. (2000) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____, *Nicomachean Ethics.* Translated by Broadie, S.; Rowe, C. (2002) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____, *Nicomachean Ethics.* Translated by Reeve, C. D. C. (2014) Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett Pub. Co.

_____, *History of Animals*. Translated by Balme, D. M. (1991) (LCL 437, 438, 439) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Artemidorus, *Oneirocritica*. Translated by Harris-McCoy, D. E. (2012) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*. Translated by Gulick, C. B. (1927-1941) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____, *The Learned Banqueters*. Translated by Olson, S. D. (2011) (LCL 345) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Callimachus, *On the bath of Pallas*. Translated by Mair, A. W., Mair, G. R. (1921) (LCL 129) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 112-123.

Clement of Alexandria, *The Exhortation to the Greeks*. Translated by Butterworth, G. W. (1919) (LCL 92) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 2-264.

Demosthenes, *Against Apaturius.* Translated by MacDowell, D. M. (2004) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 8) Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 95-109.

_____, *On the Dishonest Embassy*. Translated by Yunis, H. (2005) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 9) Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 114-216.

_____, *Against Neaera*. Translated by Bers, V. (2003) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 6) Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 151-194.

Didache. Translated by Ehrman, B. D. (2003) (LCL 24) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 405-450.

Dinarchus, *Against Demosthenes*. Translated by Worthington, I. (2001) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 5). Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 1-58.

Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by Hicks, R. D. (1925) (LCL 184, 185) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dissoi Logoi. Translated by Laks, A.; Most, G. W. (2016) (LCL 532) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 164-207.

Epistle of Barnabas. Translated by Ehrman, B. D. (2003) (LCL 25) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 3-85.

Euripides, *The Bacchae*. Translated by Dodds, E. R. (1962) London: Oxford University Press.

_____, *Les Bacchantes*. Translated by Roux, J. (1970-72) Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres.

_____, *As Bacantes*. Translated by Pereira, M. H. R. (1992) Lisboa: Edições 70.

_____, *The Bacchae*. Translated by Seaford, R. (1996) Warminster: Aris & Philips Ltd.

_____, *Bacchae*. Translated by Kovacs, D. (2002) (LCL 495) London: Cambridge: Harvard University Press. pp. 2-156.

_____, *I Cretesi*. Translated by Cantarella, R. (1964) Milano: Istituto Editoriale Italiano.

_____, *Cretans*. Translated by Collard, et. all. (1995) Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

_____, *Hippolytus*. Translated by Kovacs, D. (1995) (LCL 484) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 117-266.

_____, *Electra*. Translated by Kovacs, D. (1998) (LCL 9) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 141-300.

_____, *Phoenician Women.* Translated by Kovacs, D. (2002) (LCL 11) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 203-399.

_____, *Orestes.* Translated by Kovacs, D. (2002) (LCL 11) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 400-605.

_____, *Iphigenia at Aulis*. Translated by Kovacs, D. (2003) (LCL 495) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 157-346.

Galen, *Hygiene.* Translated by Johnston, I. (2018) (LCL 536). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Herodotus, *The Persian wars*. Translated by Godley, A. D. (1920) (LCL 117-120) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____, *Histories: Book V*. Edited by Hornblower, S. (2013). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____, Book I. In: Asheri, D. Lloyd, A. Corcella, A. (eds.) *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*. Oxford: Oxford University Press pp 57-218.

_____, Book II. In: Asheri, D. Lloyd, A. Corcella, A. (eds.) *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*. Oxford: Oxford University Press pp 219-378.

Hippocrates, *Coan Prenotions*. Translated by Potter, P. (2010) (LCL 509) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 103-270.

Homer, *Odyssey*. Translated by Murray, A. T. (1919) (LCL 104, 105) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____, *Iliad*. Translated by Murray, A. T. (1924) (LCL 170-171) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hyperides, *Against Athenogenes*. Translated by Cooper, C. R. (2001) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 5). Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 87-101.

Isaeus, *On the Estate of Pyrrhus*. Translated by Edwards, M. (2007) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 11) Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 42-65.

_____, *On the Estate of Ciron*. Translated by Edwards, M. (2007) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 11) Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 129-146.

_____, *On the Estate of Hagnias*. Translated by Edwards, M. (2007) (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 11) Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, pp. 172-193.

Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*. Translated by Henderson, J. (2009) (LCL 69) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 3-199.

Lysias, *Against Simon*. Translated by Lamb, W. R. M. (1930) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 70-93.

_____, *Against Simon*. Translated by Todd (2007) Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 275-346.

_____, *Concerning the Killing of Eratosthenes*. Translated by Todd (2007) Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 43-148.

_____, *Against Agoratus*. Translated by Lamb, W. R. M. (1930) (LCL 244) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 278-333.

Menander, *Georgos*. Translated by Arnott, W. G. (1979) (LCL 132) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 97-138.

_____, *Perikeiromene*. Translated by Arnott, W. G. (1997) (LCL 459) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 371-478.

_____, *Samia*. Translated by Arnott, W. G. (2000) (LCL 460) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 1-190.

Nonnos, *Dionysiaca*. Translated by Rouse, W. H. D. (1940) (LCL 344, 354, 356) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Parthenius of Nicaea, *Sufferings in Love*. Translated by Lightfoot, J. L. (2010) (LCL 508) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 548-642.

Pausanias, *Description of Greece*. Translated by Jones, W. H. S. (1918-1935) (LCL 93, 188, 272, 297, 298) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Plato, *Lysis*. Translated by Lamb, W. R. M. (1925) (LCL 166). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 1-72.

____, *Symposium*. Translated by Lamb, W. R. M. (1925) (LCL 166). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 73-246.

____, *Cratylus*. Translated by Fowler, H. N. (1926) (LCL 167) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 1-192.

____, *Laws*. Translated by Bury, R. G. (1926) (LCL 187, 192) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

____, *Charmides*. Translated by Lamb, W. R. M. (1927) (LCL 201) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 1-92.

____, *A República*. Translated by Pereira, M. H. R. (2012) Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

____, *Republic*. Translated by Emlyn-Jones, C.; Preddy, W. (2013) (LCL 276, 237) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Plutarch, *Theseus*. Translated by Perrin, B. (1914) (LCL 46) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 1-88.

_____, *Lycurgus*. Translated by Perrin, B. (1914) (LCL 46) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 203-304.

_____, *Solon*. Translated by Perrin, B. (1914) (LCL 46) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 403-500.

_____, *Cimon*. Translated by Perrin, B. (1914) (LCL 47) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 403-468.

_____, *Beasts are rational*. Translated by Helmbold, W. C. (1957) (LCL 406) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 489-536.

_____, *Dialogue on Love*. Translated by Helmbold, W. C. (1961) (LCL 425). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 303-442.

Pseudo-Xenophon, *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*. Translated by Bowersock, G. W. (1925) (LCL 183) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 459-508.

Soranus, *Gynecology*. Translated by Temkin, O. et al. (1956) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Strabo, *Geography*. Translated by Jones H. L. (1930) (LCL 241) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

The Greek Anthology. Translated by Paton, W. R. (1918) (LCL 85). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Theocritus. Edited with a translation and commentary by Gow, A. S. F. (1950). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____, *Select poems*. Translated by Dover, K. J. (1971) London: Macmillan.

_____, *A selection: Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13*. Edited by Hunter, R. (1999) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____, *Idyll 1*. Translated by Hopkinsonn N. (2015) (LCL 28) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 15-35.

_____, *Idyll 21*. Translated by Hopkinsonn N. (2015) (LCL 28) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 282-289.

Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Translated by Smith, C. F. (1919-1923) (LCL 108, 109, 110, 169) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sophocles, *Electra*. Translated by Lloyd-Jones, H. (1994) (LCL 20) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 165-322.

_____, *Antigone*. Translated by Lloyd-Jones, H. (1994) (LCL 21) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 1-128.

Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, Translated by Miller, W. (1914) (LCL 51, 52) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____, *Anabasis*. Translated by Brownson, C. L. (1998) (LCL 90) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____, *Memorabilia*. Translated by E. C. Marchant (2013) (LCL 168). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 3-380.

_____, *Oeconomicus*. Translated by E. C. Marchant (2013) (LCL 168). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 381-559.

Xenophon of Ephesus, *Anthia and Habrocomes*. Translated by Henderson, J. (2009) (LCL 69) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 212-365.

Modern Works

Ager, S. L. (2005) Familiarity Breeds: Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 125, pp. 1-34.

_____ (2006) The Power of Excess: Royal Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty. *Anthropologica*. 48(2), pp. 165-186.

Alcalde Martin, C. (1998) El mito de Leda: sus metamorphosis en la Historia del Arte. In: Calvo Martinez, J. L. (ed.) *Religión, magia y mitología en la antigüedad clásica.* Granada: Universidad de Granada pp. 9-37.

Alexander, P. C., Lupfer, S. L. (1987) Family Characteristics and Long Term Consequences Associated with Sexual Abuse. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 16(3) pp.235-245.

Alexandridis, A. (2008) Wenn Götter lieben, wenn Götter strafen: Zur Ikonographie der Zoophilie im griechischen Mythos. In: Alexandridis, A.; Wild. M.; Winkler-Horaček, L. (eds.) *Mensch und Tier in der Antike: Grenzziehung und Grenzüberschreitung.* Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, pp. 285-311.

_____ (2009) Shifting species: Animal and Human Bodies in Attic Vase Painting of the 6th and 5th Centuries B.C. In: Fögen, T.; Lee, M. M. (eds.) *Bodies and Boundaries in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 267-286.

Ameade, E. P. K., Garti, H. A. (2016) Age at Menarche and Factors that Influence It: A Study among Female University Students in Tamale, Northern Ghana. *PLoS ONE*. 11(5).

American Psychiatric Association (1952) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.* (1 ed.) Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychiatric Association (1968) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.* (2nd ed.) Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychiatric Association (1974) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.* (2nd ed. seventh printing) Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychiatric Association (1980) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.* (3rd ed.) Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychiatric Association (1987) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.* (3rd ed. revised) Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychiatric Association (1994) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.* (4th ed.) Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychiatric Association (2000) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.* (4th ed. text revised) Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychiatric Association (2013) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.* (5th ed.) Washington, DC: Author.

Ames, M. A., Houston, D. A. (1990) Legal, social, and biological definitions of pedophilia. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour.* 19(4) pp. 333-342.

Amundsen, D. W.; Diers, C. J. (1969). The age of menarche in classical Greece and Rome. *Human Biology*. 41(1) pp. 125-132.

Anagnostou-Laoutides, E., Konstan, D. (2008). Daphnis and Aphrodite: A Love Affair in Theocritus "Idyll" 1. *The American Journal of Philology*. 129/4 pp. 497-527.

Andrews, P. B. S. (1969) The Myth of Europa and Minos. *Greece & Rome*. 16(1), pp. 60-66.

Asheri, D. Lloyd, A. Corcella, A. (eds.) (2007) *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Austin, M. M. (2006) *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A selection of ancient sources in translation*. Second augmented edition. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ba, I., Bhopal, R.S. (2017) Physical, mental and social consequences in civilians who have experienced war-related sexual violence: a systematic review (1981-2014). *Public Health.* 142 pp.121-135.

Baker, A. W., Duncan, S. P. (1985) Child sexual abuse: a study of prevalence in Great Britain. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 9 pp. 457-467.

Baragwanath, Emily (2008) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bazant, J. (1992) Minos. In: *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae* (LIMC). VI. Zürich & München: Artemis Verlag pp. 570-574.

Bers, V. (2003) *Demosthenes, speeches 50-59.* (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 6) Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press

Bethe, E. (1907) Die Dorische Knabenliebe: Hire ethik und ihre idee die dorische. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*. 62 pp.438-475.

Blanshard, A. J. L. (2010) *Sex: Vice and Love from Antiquity to Modernity*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

_____ (2015) Fantasy and the homosexual orgy. Unearthing the sexual scripts of ancient Athens. In: Masterson, M.; Rabinowitz, N. S.; Robson, J. (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring gender and sexuality in the Ancient World.* London: New York: Routledge pp. 99-114.

Boer, R. (2015) From horse kissing to beastly emissions: Paraphilias in the Ancient Near East. In: Masterson, M.; Rabinowitz, N. S.; Robson, J. (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring gender and sexuality in the Ancient World*. London: New York: Routledge pp. 67-79.

Bonfante, Larissa (1989) Nudity as a Costume in Classical Art. *American Journal of Archaeology*. 93(4) pp.543-570.

Brelich, A. (1969) *Paides e parthenoi*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Bremmer, J. (1980) An enigmatic Indo-European rite: Paederasty. *Arethusa.* 13 pp. 279–98.

_____ (1987) What is a Greek Myth? In: Bremmer, Jan (org.*) Interpretations of Greek mythology*. London: Croom Helm pp. 1-9

Brisson, Luc. (1976) *Le mythe de Tirésias: essai d'analyse structurale*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Brook, Eric C. (2008) [Review] James Davidson, The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2008.07.20. http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2008/2008-07-20.html

Budin, S. L. (2016) *Artemis*. London; New York: Routledge.

Buitenwerf, R. (2003) *Book III of the Sibylline oracles and its social setting*. Leiden: Brill

Burkert, W. (1983) *Homo Necans: the anthropology of ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*. Bing, P. (trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____ (1993) Bacchic *Teletai* in the Hellenistic Age. In: Carpenter, T. H.; Faraone, C. A. (eds.) *Masks of Dionysus*. New York: Cornell University Press, pp.259-275.

Burnett, A. P. (2014) The first burial of Polyneices. "That critical chestnut". *Phoenix*. 68(3/4), pp. 201-221.

Buss, D. E. (1998) Women at the borders: Rape and nationalism in international law. *Feminist Legal Studies.* 6(2) pp. 171-203.

Butrica, J. L. (2005) Some Myths and Anomalies in the Study of Roman Sexuality. In: Verstraete, B.; Provencal, V. (eds.) *Same-sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West*. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press (published simultaneously with *Journal of Homosexuality* 49 (3-4) pp. 209-270.

Buxton, R. G. A. (1980) Blindness and Limits: Sophokles and the Logic of Myth. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 100. pp.22-37.

_____ (2009) *Forms of astonishment: Greek myths of metamorphosis*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Cairns, Douglas L. (1993) *Aidôs: the psychology and ethics of honour and shame in ancient Greek literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.

_____ (1996) Off with Her AIΔΩΣ': Herodotus 1.8.3-4. *CQ*. 46(1). pp.78-83.

_____ (1996a) Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 116 pp.1-32.

_____ (2011) Looks of Love and Loathing: Cultural Models of Vision and Emotion in Ancient Greece. *Mètis*. 9. pp.37-50.

Campbell, G. L. (ed.) (2014) *The Oxford handbook of animals in classical thought and life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cantarella, E. (2002) *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*. 2nd ed. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.

_____, (2005) Gender, Sexuality, and Law. In: Gagarin, M.; Cohen, D. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp.236-253.

Carey, C. (2001) *Aeschines*. (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 3). Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press.

Carson, A. (1990) Putting Her in Her Place: Woman, Dirt, and Desire. In: Halperin, D. M.; Winkler, J. J.; Zeitlin, F. I. (eds.) *Before sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press pp.135-170.

Cartledge, P. (2001) The Politics of Spartan Pederasty. In: *Spartan Reflections*. London: Duckworth pp. 91-105.

Cartledge, P.; Greenwood, E. (2002) Herodotus as a Critic: Truth, Fiction, Polarity. In: Bakker, E. J.; de Jong; I. J. F.; Wees, H. V. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill pp.351-371.

Chrystal, P. (2017) *Women in ancient Greece: seclusion, exclusion, or illusion?* Stroud: Fonthill Media Limited.

Clarke, W. M. (1978) Achilles and Patroclus in Love. *Hermes*. 106 pp. 381–96.

Clarke, J. R. (2014) Sexuality and Visual Representation. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell pp.509-533.

Cohen, B. (1997) Divesting the female breast of clothes in classical sculpture. In: Koloski-Ostrow, A. O.; Lyons, C. L. (eds.) *Naked Truths: Women, sexuality and gender in classical art and archaeology*. London and New York: Routledge pp.66-92.

Cohen, D. (1989) Seclusion, Separation, and the Status of Women in Classical Athens, *Greece & Rome*. 36/1 pp.3-15.

_____ (1990) The social context of adultery at Athens. In: Cartledge, P.; Millett, P.; Todd, S. (eds.) *Nomos: essays in Athenian law, politics, and society.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press pp.147-166.

_____ (1991) *Law, sexuality and society: the enforcement of morals in classical Athens.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (1991a) Violence, and the Athenian Law of 'Hubris'. *Greece & Rome*. 38(2) pp. 171-188.

_____ (1993) Consent and Sexual relations in Classical Athens. In: Laiou, A. E. *Consent and coercion to sex and marriage in ancient and medieval societies*. Washington, D.C: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection. pp. 5-16.

_____ (1995) *Law, Violence, and Community in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, E. E. (2006) Free and Unfree Sexual Work: An Economic Analysis of Athenian Prostitution. In: Faraone, C. A.; McClure, L. K. (eds.) *Prostitutes and courtesans in the ancient world*. Madison, Wis.: London: University of Wisconsin Press pp.95-124.

_____ (2014) Sexual Abuse and Sexual Rights: Slaves' Erotic Experience at Athens and Rome. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell pp. 184-198.

_____ (2015) *Athenian Prostitution: the business of sex*. Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press.

_____ (2016) The Athenian businesswoman. Budin, S. L.; Turfa, J. M. (eds.) *Women in antiquity: real women across the ancient world*. London; New York, NY: Routledge pp.714-725.

Collard, et. all. (1995) *Euripides. Selected fragments*. 1. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Corner, S. (2011) Bringing the Outside In. The Andrōn as Brothel and the Symposium's Civic Sexuality. In Glazebrook A.; Henry, M. (eds.) *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE-200 CE*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press pp.60-85.

_____ (2014) Sumposion. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell pp.199-213.

Cox, C. A. (1989) Incest, Inheritance and the Political Forum in Fifth-Century Athens. *The Classical Journal*. 85(1), pp. 34-46.

Crisp, R. (2000) *Aristotle, Nicomachean ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cueva, E. P. (2018) Why doesn't Habrocomes run away from Aegialeus and his Mummified Wife?: Horror and the Ancient Novel. In: Futre Pinheiro, M. P.; Konstan, D.; MacQueen, B. D. (eds.) *Cultural Crossroads in the Ancient Novel*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter pp. 362-375.

Danzig, G. (2008) Rhetoric and the Ring: Herodotus and Plato on the story of Gyges as a politically expedient tale. *Greece & Rome*. 55 (2) pp.169-192.

Davidson, J. (1997) *Courtesans & fishcakes: the consuming passions of classical Athens*. London: HarperCollins.

_____ (2001) Dover, Foucault and Greek Homosexuality: Penetration and the Truth of Sex. *Past & Present*. 170 pp. 3-51.

_____ (2007) *The Greeks and Greek Love*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

_____ (2009) [Response] Davidson on Verstraete on Davidson, The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2009.11.03. http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-11-03.html

Deacy, S. (2002) The vulnerability of Athena: *Parthenoi* and Rape in Greek Myth. In: Deacy, S.; Pierce, K. F. (eds.) *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. London: Duckworth pp.43-64.

_____ (2008) *Athena*, London: Routledge.

_____ (2013) From "Flowery Tales" to "Heroic Rapes": Virginal subjectivity in the mythological meadow. *Arethusa*. 46(3). pp. 395-413.

_____ 2018. Why does Zeus rape? An evolutionary psychological perspective. In: Pimentel, M.C.; Rodrigues, N. S. (eds.) *Violence in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, pp. 103-116.

Deacy, S.; McHardy, F. (2013) Uxoricide in Pregnancy: Ancient Greek Domestic Violence in Evolutionary Perspective. *Evolutionary Psychology*. 11(5). pp.994-1010.

Delic, A., Hasanovic, M., Avdibegovic, E., Dimitrijevic, A., Hancheva, C., Scher, C., Stefanovic-Stanojevic, T., Streeck-Fischer, A., Hamburger, A. (2014) Academic model of trauma healing in post-war societies. *Acta Medica Academica*. 43(1) pp. 76-80.

Depew, M. (1994) POxy 2509 and Callimachus' Lavacrum Palladis: αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς κούρη μεγάλοιο. *The Classical Quarterly*. 44(2) pp. 410-426.

_____ (2004) Gender, Power and Poetics. In: Harder, M. A.; Regtuit, R. F.; Wakker, G.C. (eds.) *Callimachus*. Vol. 2. Leuven: Peeters pp. 117-138

Dierichs, A. (2008) *Erotik in der Kunst Griechenlands*. Mainz: von Zabern.

Dillery, J. (2004) The θεατὴς θεῶν: Josephus *CAp* 1.232 (FGrHist 609 F 10) Reconsidered. *The Classical Journal*. 99(3) pp.239-252.

_____ (2008) The ΘeathΣ: More Texts, Further Thoughts. *The Classical Journal*. 103(3) pp.243-251.

Dillon, M. (2002). *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*. London. Routledge.

Dodd, D. (2000) Athenian ideas about Cretan pederasty. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *Greek Love Reconsidered*. New York: W. Hamilton Press pp. 33–41.

Dominick, Y. H, (2007) Acting other; Atossa and instability in Herodotus. *Classical Quarterly*. 57(2) pp.432-444.

Dover, K. J. (1973) Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behaviour. *Arethusa*. 6 pp.59-73.

_____ (1974) *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford: Blackwell.

_____ (1988) Greek homosexuality and initiation. In: Dover, K.J. (ed.) *The Greeks and their Legacy (Greek and the Greeks: Collected Papers, vol. 2)*. Oxford: Blackwell pp. 115–34.

_____ (1989) *Greek Homosexuality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____ (2016) *Greek homosexuality*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Draeger, J. (2011) What Peeping Tom Did Wrong. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*. 14(1) pp.41-49.

Earls, C. M.; Lalumière, M. L. (2009) A case study of preferential Bestiality. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*. 38, pp. 605-609.

Edmonds, J. M. (1931) *Elegy and Iambus*. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Edwards, M. (2007) *Isaeus*. (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 11) Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press.

Eire, A. L.; Velasco López, M. H. (2012) *La mitología griega: lenguaje de dioses y hombres*. Madrid: Arco/Livros S. L.

English, R. B. (1915) Democritus' Theory of Sense Perception. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. 46 pp.217-227.

Erickson, W. D., Walbek, N. H., Seely, R. K. (1988) Behavior patterns of child molesters. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*. 17(1) pp.77-86.

Ferrill, A. (1978) Herodotus on Tyranny. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*. 27(3), pp. 385-398.

Fisher, N. R. E. (1992) *Hybris: a study in the values of honour and shame in ancient Greece*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

_____ (1998) Gymnasia and the democratic values of leisure. In: Cartledge, Paul; Millett, Paul; von Reden, S. (eds.) *Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp. 84–104.

_____ (2000) Symposiasts, fish-eaters and flatterers: Social mobility and moral concern in Old Comedy. In: Harvey, F.D.; Wilkins, J. (eds.) *The Rivals of Aristophanes*. London: Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales pp. 355–96.

_____ (2001) *Aeschines, Against Timarchos*. Translation and commentary by Fisher, N. New York: Oxford University Press.

Flory, S. (1978) Laughter, Tears and Wisdom in Herodotus. *The American Journal of Philology*. 99(2) pp.145-153.

Fonseca, J. B. (2016) O *topos* do voyeurismo no teatro clássico e nos mitos Gregos e do Próximo Oriente. In: Silva, M. F.; Fialho, M. C.; Brandão, J. L. (coords.) *O livro do tempo: escritas e reescritas – Teatro Greco-Latino e sua recepção*. 1. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra pp.257-266.

Forbes-Irving, P. M. C. (1990) *Metamorphosis in Greek myths*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.

Forrest, W. (1966) *The emergence of Greek democracy, 800-400 B.C.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Foucault, M. (1987) *The history of sexuality 2: The use of pleasure*. Translated by Hurley, R. London: Penguin.

Fredrick, D. (1995) Beyond the Atrium to Ariadne: Erotic Painting and Visual Pleasure in the Roman House. *Classical Antiquity*. 14(2) pp.266-288.

Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1996) Eros, desire and the gaze. In: Kampen, N. B. (ed.) *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp.81-100.

Gaca, K. (2012) Telling the Girls from the Boys and Children: Interpreting παῖδες in the Sexual Violence of Populace-Ravaging Ancient Warfare. *Illinois Classical Studies.* 35-36 pp. 85-109.

_____ (2014) Martial Rape, Pulsating Fear, and the Sexual Maltreatment of Girls (paides), Virgins (parthenoi), and Women (gynaikes) in Antiquity. *American Journal of Philology*. 135 pp. 303-57.

_____ (2015) Ancient Warfare and the Ravaging Martial Rape of Girls and Women: Evidence from Homeric Epic and Greek Drama. In: Masterson, M.; Rabinowitz, N. S.; Robson, J. (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring gender and sexuality in the Ancient World.* London: New York: Routledge pp. 278-297.

Gammie, J. G. (1986) Herodotus on Kings and Tyrants: Objective Historiography or Conventional Portraiture? *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*. 45(3), pp. 171-195.

Gardner, H. H. (2015) Curiositas, Horror, and the monstrous-feminine in Apuleius' Metamorphoses. In: Masterson, M.; Rabinowitz, N. S.; Robson, J. (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring gender and sexuality in the Ancient World.* London: New York: Routledge pp. 393-421.

Garland, R. (1985) *The Greek way of death*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Gerber, D. E. (1999) *Archilochus, Semonides, Hipponax, Greek Iambic Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giangrande, G. (1977) Aphrodite and the Oak-Trees. *Museum Philologum Londiniense*. 2, pp. 177-186.

Gilhus, I. S. (2006) *Animals, gods and humans: changing attitudes to animals in Greek, Roman and early Christian ideas*. London; New York: Routledge.

Glazebrook, A. (2005) The Making of a Prostitute: Apollodoros's Portrait of Neaira. *Arethusa*. 38(2) pp.161-187.

_____ (2006) The Bad Girls of Athens: The Image and Function of Hetairai in Judicial Oratory. In: Faraone, C. A.; McClure, L. K. (eds.) *Prostitutes and courtesans in the ancient world*. Madison, Wis.: London: University of Wisconsin Press pp.125-138.

_____ (2006b) Prostituting female kin (Plut. Sol. 23.1-2). *Dike: Rivista di storia del diritto greco ed ellenistico*. 8 pp. 33-54.

_____ (2011) Porneion. In: Glazebrook A.; Henry, M. (eds.) *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE-200 CE*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press pp.34-59.

_____ (2016) Prostitutes, women, and gender in ancient Greece. Budin, S. L.; Turfa, J. M. (eds.) *Women in antiquity: real women across the ancient world*. London; New York, NY: Routledge pp.703-713.

Glazebrook. A.; Mellor, N. (2013) Bodies & Sexuality. In: *A Cultural History of Women in Antiquity*. London: Bloomsbury pp.33-55.

Glazebrook, A., Olson, K. (2014) Greek and Roman Marriage. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell pp. 69-82.

Golden, M. (1985) *Pais*, «child» and «slave». *L'antiquité classique.* 54(1) pp. 91-104.

_____ (2015) *Children and childhood in classical Athens*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Golden, M., Toohey, P. (2011) Introduction. In: Golden, M., Toohey, P. (eds.) *A Cultural History of Sexuality in the Classical World*. London: Bloomsbury.

Goldhill, S. (2002) The erotic experience of looking: Cultural conflict and the gaze in empire culture. In: Nussbaum, M. C.; Sihvola, J. (eds.) *The sleep of reason: erotic experience and sexual ethics in ancient Greece and Rome*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press pp.374-399.

Gould, J. (1980) Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 100 pp.38-59.

_____ (1989) *Herodotus*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Graf, F. (2002) Myth in Ovid. In: Hardie, P. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge: New York: Cambridge University Press pp. 108-121.

Graham, D. W. (2010) *The texts of early Greek philosophy: the complete fragments and selected testimonies of the major Presocratics*. I-II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graupner, H. (2000) Sexual consent: the criminal law in Europe and overseas. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*. 29(5) pp.415-461.

Gray, V. J. (1996) Herodotus and Images of Tyranny: The Tyrants of Corinth. *The American Journal of Philology*. 117(3), pp. 361-389.

Griffin, J. (2007) Herodotus and Tragedy. In Dewald, C.; Marincola, J. (eds.) *Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp.46–59.

Gutzwiller, K. (1991) *Theocritus' pastoral analogies: the formation of a genre*. Madison: Wisconsin U.P.

_____ (2006) The herdsman in Greek thought. In: Fantuzzi, M.; Papanghelis, T. (eds.) *Brill's companion to Greek and Latin pastoral*. Leiden: Brill, pp.1-24.

Haddad, H. N. (2011) Mobilizing the will to prosecute: crimes of rape at the Yugoslav and Rwandan tribunals. *Human Rights Review.* 12 pp. 109-132.

Halperin, D. M. (1990a) Why is Diotima a woman? Platonic Erōs and the figuration of gender. In: Halperin, D. M.; Winkler, J. J.; Zeitlin, F. I. (eds.) *Before sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press pp.257-308.

_____ (1990b) *One hundred years of homosexuality: and other essays on Greek love*. London: New York: Routledge.

_____ (1998) Forgetting Foucault: Acts, Identities, and the History of Sexuality. *Representations.* 63 pp. 93-120.

Harden, A. (2013) *Animals in the classical world: ethical perspectives from Greek and Roman texts*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harris, E. M. (2013) *The rule of law in action in democratic Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (2015) "Yes" and "no" in women's desire. In: Masterson, M.; Rabinowitz, N. S.; Robson, J. (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring gender and sexuality in the Ancient World*. London: New York: Routledge pp. 298-314.

Hart, J. (1993) *Herodotus and Greek history*. London: John Hart, in association with The Self Publ. Assoc. Ltd.

Hartog, F. (1988) *The mirror of Herodotus: the representation of the other in the writing of history*. Lloyd, J. (tr.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hartt, F. (1976) *Art - A History of Painting, Sculpture, Architecture (Prehistory, Ancient World, Middle Ages)*. 1. New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc.

Hasanović, M. (2017) Healing invisible wounds – have we done enough to help the victims of wartime rape? *Acta Medica Academica*. 46(2) pp. 175-176.

Heath, J. (1992) *Actaeon, the unmannerly intruder: the myth and its meaning in classical literature*. New York: P. Lang.

Hinderliter, A.C. (2010) Defining paraphilia: Excluding exclusion. *Open Access Journal of Forensic Psychology*. 2, pp. 241-272.

_____ (2011) Defining paraphilia in *DSM-5*: Do not disregard grammar. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy.* 37, pp. 17-31.

Holoyda, B.; Newman, W. (2014) Zoophilia and the law: legal responses to a rare paraphilia. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*. 41, pp. 412-420.

Hornblower, S.; Spawforth, A. (2012) *The Oxford classical dictionary*. Fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hubbard, T. K. (1998) Popular perceptions of elite homosexuality in Classical Athens. Arion. 6(1) (Third series), 48–78.

_____ (2000) Pederasty and democracy: The marginalization of a social practice. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *Greek Love Reconsidered*. New York: W. Hamilton Press pp. 1–11.

_____ (2003) *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____ (2005) Pindar's Tenth Olympian and Athlete-Trainer Pederasty. In: Verstraete, B.; Provencal, V. (eds.) *Same-sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West*. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press (published simultaneously with *Journal of Homosexuality* 49 (3-4) pp. 137–71.

_____ (2006) History's first child molester: Euripides' Chrysippus and the marginalization of pederasty in Athenian democratic discourse. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*. Vol 49 (Supplement 87 - Greek Drama III: Essays in Memory of Kevin Lee) pp. 223–244.

_____ (2009) The paradox of "Natural" heterosexuality with "unnatural" women. The Classical World. 102(3) pp.249-258.

_____ (2009a) [Review] James Davidson. The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece and Andrew Lear & Eva Cantarella. Images of Ancient Greek Pederasty: Boys were Their Gods. *H-*

Histsex. http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx;list=H Histsex;month=0902;week=b;msg=Ug%2BYuljwHAbsmjyw%2BhMXhQ 04/11/2017

_____ (2010) Sexual Consent and the Adolescent Male, or What Can We Learn from the Greeks? *Boyhood Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal.* 4(2) pp. 126–148

_____ (2013) The irreducibility of myth: Plato's Phaedrus, Apollo, Admetus, and the problem of pederastic hierarchy. *Phoenix.* 67(1/2) pp. 81-106.

_____ (2014) Peer Homosexuality. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell pp. 128–49.

Immerwahr, H. R. (1985) Herodotus. In: Easterling, P. E.; Knox B. M. W. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 426-440.

James, S. L. (2012) Sex and the Single Girl: The Cologne Fragment of Archilochus. In. James, S. L., Dillon, S. (eds.) *A companion to women in the ancient world.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell pp. 81-83.

Janko, R. (1984) P. Oxy. 2509": Hesiod's "Catalogue" on the Death of Actaeon. *Phoenix.* 38(4) pp.299-307.

Janssen, D.F. (2014) How to "ascertain" paraphilia? An Etymological Hint. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 43, pp. 1245-1246.

Jeanmaire, H. (1939) *Courois et Courètes: Essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité hellénique*. Lille: Bibliothèque universitaire.

Johns, C. (1982) *Sex or symbol: erotic images of Greece and Rome*. London: British Museum.

Johnson, D. M. (2001) Herodotus' Storytelling Speeches: Socles (5.92) and Leotychides (6.86). *The Classical Journal*. 97(1), pp. 1-26.

Johnson M, Ryan T, (2005) *Sexuality in Greek and Roman literature and society: A sourcebook.* London: Routledge.

Johnston, S. I. (1999) *Restless dead: encounters between the living and the dead in ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kamen, D. (2013) *Status in classical Athens*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Karakantza, E. (2003) The semiology of rape; The meeting of Odysseus and Nausikaa in book 6 of the Odyssey. *Classics Ireland*. 10 pp.8-26.

Karapanou, O., Papadimitriou, A. (2010) Determinants of menarche. *Reproductive Biology and Endocrinology*. 8 pp. 115-123.

Kennell, N. M. (1999) Age Categories and Chronology in the Hellenistic Theseia. *Phoenix.* 53(3/4) pp. 249-262.

Keuls, E. C. (1993) *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kilmer, M. (2002) Rape in early red-figure pottery: violence and threat in homo-erotic and hetero-erotic contexts. In: Deacy, S.; Pierce, K. F. (eds.) *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. London: Duckworth.

Kinsey, A.C.; Pomeroy, W. B.; Martin, C. E. (1948) *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: Saunders.

Konstan, D. (2002) Women, Boys, and the Paradigm of Athenian Pederasty. *A Journal of Feminist Studies*. 13(2) pp. 35-56.

_____ (2013) Between appetite and emotion, or why can't animals have Erôs? In: Sanders, E. et. al. (eds.) *Erôs in ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuwert, P., Glaesmer, H., Eichhorn, S., Grundke, E., Pietrzak, R. H., Freyberger, H. J., Klauer, T. (2014) Long-term effects of conflict related sexual violence compared with non-sexual war trauma in female World War II survivors: a matched pairs study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 43 pp. 1059–1064.

Kurtz, D. C.; Boardman, J. (1971) *Greek burial customs*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Lacy, R. L. (1990) Aktaion and a Lost 'Bath of Artemis'. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 110 pp.26-42.

Laes, C. (2010) When Classicists need to speak up: Antiquity and present day Pedophilia – Pederasty. In: Sofronievski, V. (ed.) *Aeternas Antiquitatis: Proceedings of the Symposium held in Skopje, August 28 as part of the 2009 annual conference of EuroClassica*. Skopje: ACPh Antika & Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje pp. 30–59.

_____ (2011) *Children in the Roman Empire: outsiders within*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laks, A. (1990) On the Relationship between Plato's "Republic" and "Laws". *Classical Antiquity*. 9(2) pp.209-229.

Lamb, W. R. M. (1930) *Lysias*. (LCL 244) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Långström, N. (2010) The DSM Diagnostic Criteria for Exhibitionism, Voyeurism, and Frotteurism. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 39(2) pp.317-24.

Lanni, A. (2010) The expressive effect of the Athenian prostitution laws. *Classical Antiquity*. 29(1) pp. 45-67.

Lateiner, D. (1989) *The historical method of Herodotus*. Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press.

Lawrence, A. W. (1973) *Greek architecture*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Lear, A. (2008) Anacreon's 'Self': An alternative role model for the Archaic elite male? *American Journal of Philology.* 129 pp. 47–76.

_____ (2011) The pederastic elegies and the authorship of the Theognidea. *Classical Quarterly*. 61 pp. 378–93.

_____ (2014) Ancient Greek pederasty: An introduction. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell pp. 102–27.

_____ (2015) Was pederasty problematized? A diachronic view. In: Masterson, M.; Rabinowitz, N. S.; Robson, J. (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring gender and sexuality in the Ancient World.* London: New York: Routledge pp. 115-136.

Lear, A. and Cantarella, E. (2008) *Images of Ancient Greek Pederasty: Boys were their Gods*. London: Routledge.

Lee, M. M. (2009) Body modifications in Classical Greece. In: Fögen, T.; Lee, M. (eds.) *Bodies and Boundaries in Graeco-Roman Antiquity.* Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter pp.155-181.

_____ (2015a) Other "Ways of Seeing": Female Viewers of the Knidian Aphrodite. *Helios*. 42(1) pp.103-122.

_____ (2015b) Body, Dress and Identity in Ancient Greece. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Levine, M. (1995) The Gendered Grammar of Ancient Mediterranean Hair. In: Doniger, W.; Eilberg-Schwartz, H. (eds.) *Off with Her Head! The Denial of Women's Identity in Myth, Religion, and Culture.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press pp.76-130.

Lefkowitz, M. R. (1986) *Women in Greek myth*. London: Duckworth.

Licht, H. (1932) *Sexual life in ancient Greece*. London: Abbey Library.

Lissarrague, F. (1990) The Sexual Life of Satyrs. In: Halperin, D. M.; Winkler, J. J.; Zeitlin, F. I. (eds.) *Before sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press pp. 53-82.

_____ (1999) Publicity and performance: Kalos inscriptions in Attic vase-painting. In: Goldhill, S.; Osborne, R. (eds.) *Performance, Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp. 359–73.

Livingstone, N. (2011) Instructing Myth: From Homer to the Sophists. In: Dowden, K.; Livingstone, N. (eds.) *A companion to Greek mythology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Llewellyn-Jones, L. (2001) Sexy Athena: The Dress and Erotic. Representation of a Virgin War-Goddess. In: Deacy, S.; Villing, A. (eds.) *Athena in the Classical World*. Boston: Brill pp.233-257.

_____, (2003) *Aphrodite's tortoise: the veiled woman of ancient Greece*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

_____, (2007) House and Veil in Ancient Greece. In: Fisher, N.; Westgate, R.; Whitley, J. (eds.) *Building Communities: House, settlement and society in the Aegean and beyond*. London: British School at Athens pp.251-58.

Lonsdale, S. H. (1979) Attitudes towards animals in ancient Greece. *Greece & Rome*. 26/2 pp. 146-159.

Loraux, N. (1992) What is a Goddess? In: Duby, G.; Perrot, M. (eds.) *A History of Women in the West I: From Ancient Goddesses to Christian Saints*. London: Harvard University Press pp.11-45.

_____ (1995) *The experiences of Tiresias: the feminine and the Greek man*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

MacDowell, D. M. (1976) 'Hybris' in Athens. *Greece & Rome*. 23(1) pp.14-31.

_____, (1989) Athenian Laws about Choruses. In: Nieto, F. J. F. (ed.) *Symposion 1982*. Koln: Bohlau-Verlag pp. 65-77.

_____, (1995) *Aristophanes and Athens: an introduction to the plays*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

_____, (2004) *Demosthenes, speeches 27-38*. (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 8). Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press.

Magalhães, José Malheiro (2015) *Sangue em Vinho: O que tem Jesus Cristo que ver com Dioniso*. Masters Thesis. Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/31771634/Sangue_em_Vinho_O_que_tem_Jesus_Cristo_que_ver_com_Dioniso

_____ (2016) Laivos de feminilidade na Atena homérica. *Cadmo*. 25 pp.25-40.

Margon, J. S. (1972) The second burial of Polyneices. *The Classical Journal*. 68(1), pp.39-49.

Martens, J. W. (2009) Do Not Sexually Abuse Children: The language of early Christian sexual ethics. In: Horn, C. B., Phenix, R. R. (eds.) *Children in Late Ancient Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck pp. 227-254.

Masters, R. E. L. (1962). *Forbidden Sexual Behavior & Morality*. New York, NY: Lancer Books, Inc.

Mayor, A. (2014) Animals in warfare. In: Campbell, G. L. (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of animals in classical thought and life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 282-293.

McGinn, T. A. J. (2014) Prostitution: Controversies and New Approaches. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell pp. 83-101.

McMahon, John M. (1998) *Paralysin cave: impotence, perception, and text in the Satyrica of Petronius*. Leiden: Brill.

Metzl, J. M. (2004) From Scopophilia to 'Survivor': A Brief History of Voyeurism, 1950-2004. *Textual Practice*. 18(3) pp.415-34.

Michalopoulos, Charilaos N. (2012) Tiresias between texts and sex. *EuGeStA*. 2 pp.221-239.

Miletski, H. (2002) *Understanding Bestiality and Zoophilia*. East-West Publishing, LLC.

_____ (2017) Zoophilia: Another Sexual Orientation? *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*. 46, pp. 39-42.

Mirto, M. S. (2012) *Death in the Greek world: from Homer to the classical age*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Moles, J. (2007) 'Saving' Greece from the 'ignominy' of tyranny? The 'famous' and 'wonderful' speech of Socles (5.92). In: Irwin, E.; Greenwood, E. (eds.) *Reading*

Herodotus: a study of the logoi in book 5 of Herodotus' Histories. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 245-268.

Money, J. (1984) Paraphilias: Phenomenology and classification. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*. 38(2), pp. 164-179.

Moreau, P. (2002) *Incestus et prohibitae nuptiae: conception romaine de l'inceste et histoire des prohibitions matrimoniales pour cause de parenté dans la Rome antique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 2002.

Morris, I. (1989) Attitudes toward Death in Archaic Greece. *Classical Antiquity*. 8(2), pp. 296-320.

Morrison, A.D. (2005) Sexual ambiguity and the identity of the narrator in Callimachus' *Hymn to Athena*. *BICS*. 48 pp. 27-46.

Moser, C. (2001) Paraphilia: A critique of a confused concept. In: Kleinplatz, P.J. (ed.) *New Directions in Sex Therapy: Innovations and Alternatives.* Philadelphia: Brunner-Routledge, pp. 91-108.

Moser, C. & Kleinplatz, P.J. (2005) DSM-IV-TR and the paraphilias: An argument for removal. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality.* 17(3/4), pp. 91-109.

Mulvey, L. (1975) Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. *Screen*. 16(3) pp. 6–18.

Natali, C. (2009) Nicomachean Ethics: VII. 5 – 6: Beastliness, Irascibility, akrasia. In: Natali, C. (ed.) *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics, Book VII – Symposium Aristotelicum.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nevett, Lisa C. (1999) *House and society in the ancient Greek world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (2005) Between urban and rural: House-form and social relations in Attic villages and Deme centers. In: Ault, Bradley A.; Nevett, Lisa C. (eds.) *Ancient Greek houses and households: chronological, regional, and social diversity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press pp.83-98.

Newbold, R. F. (2008) Curiosity and Exposure in Nonnos. *GRBS*. 48 pp.71-94.

Newmyer, S. T. (2006) *Animals, rights, and reason in Plutarch and modern ethics*. New York; London: Routledge.

_____ (2011) *Animals in Greek and Roman thought: a sourcebook*. London: Routledge.

_____ (2014) Animals in Plutarch. In: Beck, M. (ed.) *A companion to Plutarch*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

Nicholson, N. (2000) Pederastic Poets and Adult Patrons. *The Classical World*. 93 pp. 235–9.

Ogden, D. (1996) Homosexuality and Warfare in Ancient Greece. In: Lloyd, A. (ed.) *Battle in Antiquity*. London: Duckworth pp. 107–69.

Ogilvie, R. M. (1962) The Song of Thyrsis. *Journal Hellenic Studies*. 82 pp. 106–10.

Ormand, K. (2009) *Controlling desires: sexuality in ancient Greece and Rome.* Westport, Conn.; London: Praeger.

_____ (2009b) [Response] Ormand on Davidson on Verstraete on Davidson, The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2009.11.03.

Osborne, R. (2002) Archaic Greek History. In: Bakker, E.; de Jong, I.; Wees, H. (eds.) *Brill's companion to Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 497-520.

Packman, Z. M. (1991) The Incredible and the Incredulous: The Vocabulary of Disbelief in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. *Hermes*. 119 (4) pp.399-414.

Papadimitropoulos, L. (2008) Heracles as Tragic Hero. *Classical World*. 101(2), pp. 131-138.

Papadopoulos, J. K. (1994) Pasiphae. In: *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae* (LIMC). VII. Zürich & München: Artemis Verlag pp. 193-200.

Papillon, T. L. (2004) *Isocrates II*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Pathak, P. K., Tripathi, N., Subramanian, S.V (2014) Secular Trends in Menarcheal Age in India-Evidence from the Indian Human Development Survey. *PLoS ONE* 9(11).

Pearson, L. (1954) Real and Conventional Personalities in Greek History. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* 15(1), pp. 136-145.

Pélékidis, C. (1962) *Histoire de'éphébie attiques des origines à 31 av. J.-C*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Pellizer, E. (1993) Periandro di Corinto e il forno freddo. In Pretagostini, R. (ed.) *Tradizione nella Cultura Greca da Omero all' età Ellenistica: scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili*. 2. Roma: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, pp. 801-11.

Percy, W. A, (1996) *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*. Urbana, IL: Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois.

_____ (2005) Reconsiderations about Greek Homosexualities. In: Verstraete, B.; Provencal, V. (eds.) *Same-sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West*. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press (published simultaneously with *Journal of Homosexuality* 49 (3-4) pp. 13–61.

Pereira, M. H. R. (2014) Amizade, amor e eros na *Ilíada*. In: *Estudos sobre a Grécia Antiga: Artigos*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian pp.113-126.

Petropoulou, A. (1988) The Interment of Patroklos (Iliad 23.252-57). *The American Journal of Philology*. 109(4), pp. 482-495.

Phillips, D. D. (2013) *The law of ancient Athens*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Podlecki, A. J. (1974) Individual and Group in Euripides' Bacchae. *L'antiquité classique.* 43(1) pp.143-165.

Pomeroy, S. B. (1975) *Goddesses, whores, wives, and slaves: women in classical antiquity*. New York: Schocken Books.

Priebe, G., Svedin, C. G. (2008) Child sexual abuse is largely hidden from the adult society: An epidemiological study of adolescents' disclosures. *Child Abuse & Neglect.* 32 pp. 1095–1108.

Provencal, V. (2005) Glukus Himeros: Pederastic Influence on the Myth of Ganymede. In: Verstraete, B.; Provencal, V. (eds.) *Same-sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West*. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press (published simultaneously with *Journal of Homosexuality* 49 (3-4) pp. 87-136.

Puliatti, S. (2001) *Incesti crimina: regime giuridico da Augusto a Giustiniano*. Milano: A. Giuffrè.

Purves, A. (2014) In the bedroom: Interior space in Herodotus' *Histories*. In: Gilhuly, K.; Worman, N. (eds.) *Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press pp.94-129.

Rabinowitz, N. S. (2002) Excavating Female Homoeroticism in Ancient Greece: The Evidence from Attic Vase Painting. In: Rabinowitz, N. S.; Auanger, L. (eds.) *Among Women: From the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World*. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press pp. 106-166.

Rabinowitz, N. S.; Auanger, L. (eds.) (2002) *Among Women: From the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World*. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press.

_____ (2013) Women as subject and object of the gaze in tragedy. *Helios*. 40 (1-2) pp.195-221.

Radford, L., Corral, S., Bradley, C., Fisher, H., Bassett, C., Howat, N., Collishaw, S. (2011). *Child abuse and neglect in the UK today*. Available online: https://www.nspcc.org.uk/globalassets/documents/research-reports/child-abuse-neglect-uk-today-research-report.pdf

Ranger, R.; Fedoroff, P. (2014) Commentary: zoophilia and the law. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*. 42, pp. 421-426.

Renner, Timothy (1978) A Papyrus Dictionary of Metamorphoses. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. 82 pp.277-293.

Richlin, A. (1993) Not before Sexuality: The Materiality of the cinaedus and the Roman Law against Love between Men. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*. 3 pp. 523–73.

_____ (2005) *Sexuality*. In: Hornblower, S.; Spawforth, A. (eds.) *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (2015) Reading Boy-Love and Child-Love in the Greco-Roman World. In: Masterson, M.; Rabinowitz, N. S.; Robson, J. (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring gender and sexuality in the Ancient World.* London: New York: Routledge pp. 352-373.

Robertson, M. (1988) Europa I. In: *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae (LIMC)*. IV. Zürich & München: Artemis Verlag pp. 570-574.

Robson, J. (2002) Bestiality and bestial rape in Greek myth. In: Deacy, S. & Pierce, K.F. (eds.) *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* London: Duckworth. pp. 65-96.

_____ (2006) *Humour, obscenity and Aristophanes*. Tübingen: Narr.

_____ (2013) *Sex and sexuality in classical Athens*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

_____ (2015) Fantastic sex: Fantasies of sexual assault in Aristophanes. In: Masterson, M.; Rabinowitz, N. S.; Robson, J. (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring gender and sexuality in the Ancient World*. London: New York: Routledge pp. 315-332.

Rodrigues, N. S. (2003) Messalina ou Aphrodita tragica *in Vrbe.* In: Ventura, António (org.) *Presença de Victor Jabouille*. Lisbon: Faculdade de Letras pp. 513-534.

Ross, C.A. (2015) Commentary: Problems with the sexual disorders sections of DSM-5. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse.* 24(2), pp. 195-201.

Rothaus, R. M. (1990) The single burial of Polyneices. *The Classical Journal*. 85(3), pp. 209-217.

Russo, J. (1983) The Poetics of the Ancient Greek Proverb. *Journal of Folklore Research*. 20(2/3) pp.121-130.

Rye, B.J., & Meaney, G.J. (2007) Voyeurism: It is good as long as we do not get caught. *International Journal of Sexual Health*. 19 pp.47–56.

Ryzman, M. (1993) Heracles' destructive Impulses: a Transgression of natural Laws (Sophocles' *Trachiniae*). *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*. 71(1), pp.67-79.

Said, S- (2002) Herodotus and Tragedy. In: Bakker, E. J.; de Jong; I. J. F.; Wees, H. V. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill pp.117-148.

Samson, L. G. (2013) *The philosophy of desire in Theocritus' Idylls*. PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) thesis. University of Iowa. Available at: http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/5051.

Sansone, D. (2013) Euripides, Cretans frag. 472e.16—26 Kannicht. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*. 184, pp. 58-65.

Scanlon, T. (2005) The dispersion of pederasty and the athletic revolution in sixth-century BC Greece. In: Verstraete, B.; Provencal, V. (eds.) *Same-sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West*. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press (published simultaneously with *Journal of Homosexuality* 49 (3-4) pp. 63–85.

Schlam, C. C. (1984) Diana and Actaeon: Metamorphoses of a Myth. *Classical Antiquity*. 3(1) pp.82-110

Segal, C. P. (1982) *Dionysiac poetics and Euripides' Bacchae*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sergent, B. (1986) *L'homosexualité initiatique dans l'Europe ancienne*. Paris: Payot.

_____ (1986a) *Homosexuality in Greek Myth*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Shapiro, H. A. (1981) Courtship scenes in Attic vase painting. *American Journal of Archaeology*. 85 pp. 133–43.

_____ (2000). Leagros and Euphronios: Painting Pederasty in Athens. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *Greek Love Reconsidered*. New York: W. Hamilton Press pp. 12–32.

Shapiro, J. (2015) Pederasty and the Popular Audience. In: Blondell, R.; Ormand, K. (eds.) *Ancient Sex: New Essays*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press pp. 177-207.

Shapiro, S. O. (2000) Proverbial Wisdom in Herodotus. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. 130 pp.89-118.

Shaw, B. D. (1992) Explaining Incest: Brother-Sister Marriage in Graeco-Roman Egypt. *Man*. 27(2), pp. 267-299.

Shelton, J. (2014) Spectacles of animal abuse. In: Campbell, G. L. (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of animals in classical thought and life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 461-477.

Sissa, G. (1990) *Greek virginity*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

_____ (2014) *Phusis* and Sensuality: Knowing the body in Greek erotic culture. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell pp.265-281.

Skinner, M. B. (2005) *Sexuality in Greek and Roman culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Slater, W. J. (1986) *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*. Berlin; New York: de Gruyter.

Smit, D. W. (1992/93) Paiderastia: A Greek Practice Reconsidered. *Talanta*. 24/25 pp. 99-116.

Soares, C. (2008) Norma e Transgressão: contributos para a definição de padrões de identidade/alteridade nas Histórias de Heródoto. In: Soares, C.; Secall, I. C.; Fialho, M. C. (coord.) *Norma & Transgressão*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra pp.29-40.

_____ (2014) Dress and Undress in Herodotus' *Histories*. *Phoenix*. 68(3-4) pp.222-234.

Leão, D.; Rhodes, P. J. (2015) *The laws of Solon.* London: I.B. Tauris.

Sorabji, R. (1993) *Animal minds & human morals: the origins of the Western debate*. London: Duckworth.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1991) *Reading Greek culture: texts and images, rituals and myths*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Stansbury-O'Donnel, M. D. (2014) Desirability and the Body. In: Hubbard, T. K. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell pp.31-53.

Stephens, S. (2011) Introduction. In: Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin; Lehnus, Luigi; Stephens, Susan (eds.) *Brill's companion to Callimachus*. Leiden; Boston: Brill. pp.1-19.

Stripling, J. (2009) Et Tu, New Publisher? *Inside Higher Ed.* https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/06/11/et-tu-new-publisher

Thumiger, C. (2013) Vision and Knowledge in Greek Tragedy. *Helios*. 40(1-2) pp.223-245.

_____ (2014) Metamorphosis: humans into animals. In: Campbell, G. L. (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of animals in classical thought and life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 384-413.

Todd, S. C. (2007) *A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 1–11*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tomori, C., McFall, A. M., Srikrishnan, A. K., Mehta, S. H., Nimmagadda, N., Anand, S., Vasudevan, C. K., Solomon, S., Solomon, S. S., Celentano, D. D. (2016) The prevalence and impact of childhood sexual abuse on HIV-risk behaviors among men who have sex with men (MSM) in India. *BMC Public Health*. 16 (784).

Trümper, M. (2012) Gender and Space, "Public" and "Private". In. James, S. L.; Dillon, S. (eds.) *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell pp.288-303.

Walcot, P. (1984) Greek Attitudes towards Women: The Mythological Evidence. *Greece & Rome*. 31(1) pp.37-47.

Walker, H. J. (1995) *Theseus and Athens*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Waters, K. H. (1971) Herodotos on tyrants and despots: a study in objectivity. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*. 15, pp. 1-44.

West, M. L. (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Whincup, P. H., Gilg, J. A., Odoki, K., Taylor, S. J. C., Cook, D. G. (2001) Age of menarche in contemporary British teenagers: survey of girls born between 1982 and 1986. *BMJ*. 322 pp.1095-96.

White, H. (1986) A case of pastoral humour in Theocritus. *Museum Philologum Londiniense*. 7, pp. 147-149.

_____ (2004) Further notes on the *Idylls* of Theocritus. *VELEIA*. 21, pp. 147-157.

Wiederman, M.W. (2003) Paraphilia and fetishism. *The Family Journal.* 11(3), pp. 315-321.

Wilson, H. W., Widom, C. S. (2010) Does physical abuse, sexual abuse, or neglect in childhood increase the likelihood of same-sex sexual relationships and cohabitation? A prospective 30-year follow-up. *Archive of Sexual Behavior*. 39 pp. 63-74.

Winkler, J. J. (1990) *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York; London: Routledge.

Winkler, J. J. (1990a) Laying down de law: the oversight of men's sexual behavior in Classical Athens. In: Halperin, D. M.; Winkler, J. J.; Zeitlin, F. I. (eds.) *Before Sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press pp. 171-210.

Woodford, S. (1992) Minotauros. In: *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae* (LIMC). VI. Zürich & München: Artemis Verlag pp. 574-581.

Worthington, I.; Cooper, C.; Harris, E. M. (2001) *Dinarchus, Hyperides, & Lycurgus*. (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 5). Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press.

Vattuone, R. (2004) *Il mostro e il sapiente: studi sull'erotica greca*. Bologna: Pàtron.

Verstraete, B. (2009) [Review] James Davidson, The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2009.09.61. http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-09-61.html

Vivante, B. (2007) *Daughters of Gaia: women in the ancient Mediterranean world.* Westport, Conn.; London: Praeger Publishers.

Younger, John G (2011) Sexual Peculiarities of the Ancient Greeks and Romans. In: Golden, Mark; Toohey, Peter (eds.) *Sexuality in the Classical World*. Oxford: Berg Publishing pp.55-86.

Yunis, H. (2005) *Demosthenes, speeches 18 and 19*. (The Oratory of Classical Greece, 9). Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press